DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 492 95 SO 009 708

AUTHOR	Farnen, Russell F., Jr.; Smith, Mansfield I.
TITLE	Civic, Citizenship, and Citizen Education: A National Conference Evaluation Report (Phase I). Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Citizen Education Staff.
PUB DATE	Nov 76
CONTRACT	P00-76-0471
NOTE	149p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Action Research; *Citizenship; *Civics; *Conference Reports; *Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Feedback; Political Science; Program Length; Questioning Techniques; Questionnaires; Scheduling; Systems Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	Delphi Technique

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the evaluation of a national conference on "Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good" held in Kansas City, Missouri, on September 20-23, 1976. Participants were 400 persons who are interested or involved in political education. The conference involved speeches and papers from experts and leaders in the field, information dissemination about activities in key areas, task-oriented work groups, and improvement of the political education system. The report covers participant, leader, and evaluation team views of the conference, including conclusions, recommendations, evaluation of the Delphi process used at the conference, and followup activities. The evaluation format used the feedback process of a systems analysis model. Every major activitiy was assessed while in action, such as registration, room arrangements, major presentations, and work groups. Questionnaires obtained information about participant background, involvement in citizen education, views of the conference activities, views of conference goals, and suggestions for conference improvement. Different questionnaires were used to query participants; participants/observers; work group facilitators/host recorders; and resource persons/presenters. The Delphi technique was used to seek closure on citizen education task definition. The conference was evaluated as a success. However, hostility was expressed toward the Delphi process as a time intrusion, which is indicative of complaints about time constraints, an overstructured program, and little opportunity for interaction and exchange. Questionnaire return rate was 50%, but it was suspected that returns were received only from polite, submissive, and contented persons. Appendices contain the questionnaires and response data. (ND)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED134492

Interim Report
November, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CIVIC, CITIZENSHIP, AND CITIZEN EDUCATION
A NATIONAL CONFERENCE EVALUATION REPORT (PHASE I)

by Russell F. Farnen, Jr.
Principal Investigator
Professor of Political Science
Madison College
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801

and

Mansfield I. Smith, Co-Evaluator and
Consultant on Non-Formal Education
3720 Morningside Drive
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

SO009708

Submitted to:

Citizen Education Staff
U.S. Office of Education
Office of the Commissioner
Washington, D. C.

Contract #POO 76-0471

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE (S)

PREFACE i-iii

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1-15

II. THE PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS OF THE CONFERENCE 16-40

III. THE LEADERS' VIEWS OF THE CONFERENCE 41-50

IV. THE EVALUATION TEAM'S VIEWS OF THE CONFERENCE 51-82

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 83-98

VI. EVALUATION OF THE DELPHI PROCESS: A SPECIAL CASE STUDY 99-106

VII. FURTHER ANALYSIS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES (PHASE I) 107-108

APPENDIX I FROM #1 PART A--CONFERENCE/PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM 109-119

APPENDIX II FORM #2 PART B--CONFERENCE/PARTICIPANT OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE 120-125

APPENDIX III FORM #3 SPECIAL ACTIVITY LEADER'S/WORK GROUP FACILITATOR'S/HOST RECORDER'S EVALUATION FORM 126-127

APPENDIX IV FORM #4--RESOURCE PERSON'S/PRESENTER'S EVALUATION FORM 128

APPENDIX V PARTICIPANT OBSERVER'S EVALUATION FORM 129-130

APPENDIX VI PARTICIPANT RESPONSES--WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN FUTURE CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES, BY CATEGORY 131-132

APPENDIX VII LISTING OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES--STRONGEST POINTS OF THE MEETING 133-137

APPENDIX VIII CATEGORIZATION OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES--STRONGEST POINTS OF THE MEETING 138-143

PREFACE

This report stands as an independent evaluation of one segment of the long-term and substantial commitment to citizen education which the USOE has made in the past and intends for the future. Our conservative estimate of the total costs and expenses of the Kansas City conference on "Education and Citizenship" (including speakers' fees, travel expenses, hotel rooms, staff and participant time, etc.) amounts to some $400,000. Any expenditure of this magnitude from the federal treasury in the human services area requires some measure of costs and the benefits accruing therefrom.

The report summarizes the independent evaluation effort of a team of external evaluators who were commissioned by the Citizen Education Staff of the USOE to provide a separate audit of a major and unique national conference on civic, citizen, and citizenship education. This conference brought together some four hundred persons who are interested or involved in political education on a formal or informal basis. The conference sought to expose this group to major speeches and papers presented by experts and exemplary leaders in the field. It disseminated information about special activities underway in seven key areas (political participation, global perspectives, economic, ethnic and multi-cultural, law-related, family, and ethical/moral education). Another conference objective was to encourage participants to interact with one another in task-oriented work groups and to reach some consensus about the nature of political education.

The civic responsibilities of the major sectors (home, labor, agriculture, media, business, education, government, religion, and voluntary organizations) of American life and how our political education system at all levels could be improved (including one's personal commitment to the task) now and in the next quarter century were also major segments of the meetings.

Since these were significant objectives, a substantial evaluation plan had to be devised to account for them. Consequently, the services of two independent evaluators, the authors of this report, were offered and accepted by the Citizen Education Staff. The enormity of the undertaking was not readily apparent at first; time estimates were soon surpassed and even sooner ignored. As one example, we estimate that the staff, consultants, and participants spent the equivalent of four full-time months of work by one person in preparing, reviewing, reproducing, distributing, completing, collecting, processing, tabulating, interpreting, and reporting these evaluation results. Therefore, we believe that this evaluation effort was as thorough as available time and resources could provide, given the present limits of technology in this surprisingly little worked field of conference evaluation.

At this point in introducing this report, we would like to recognize the valuable assistance provided by Mr. Logan Sallada, Policy Adviser to the Commissioner, and by the USOE Citizen Education Staff under the direction of Mr. George Lowe. Other members of this staff who provided the researchers with their advice or assistance at one stage or another were Ms. Elizabeth Farquhar, Ms. Susan Wiener, Mr. Mike Smith, Ms. Francos Skane, Ms. Jean Carey, and Ms. Joyce Chase. Ms. Theresa Baker of Madison College typed the entire report in record time.

Additionally, the other members of our on-site evaluation team in Kansas City provided us with valuable insights into how best to implement the project there while assisting in the conference evaluation itself. These co-evaluators were Dr. Badi Foster of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Dr. Harrison Fox of the U.S. Senate Committee on Committees Staff, Washington, D. C.; Mr. David Roe, Office of the Secretary of HEW in Washington, D. C.; Mr. Glenn Kamber, Department of HEW, Washington, D. C.; and Dr. Eric Mondschein, USOE, Washington, D. C. (Dr. Foster and Dr. Fox had both served on the advisory committee for the conference.) Without their assistance, it would not have been possible to sample the work group and special activity sessions or to obtain multiple viewpoints on common experiences such as the formal presentations.

Throughout the report, we have attempted to be as objective and bias-free as possible in the measurement design, the survey, and interpretations of our findings. Of course, some errors in judgment and unconscious inaccuracies always seem to find their way into any written report. We assume full responsibility for any such defects. Further, we request the reader to point them out as discovered, so that we may learn from our mistakes and improve our performance in the future.

Russell F. Farnen, Jr.
Harrisonburg, Virginia

Mansfield I. Smith
Fairfax, Virginia

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This report presents the results of an independent evaluation of events leading up to and occurring during a national conference on "Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good" at Kansas City, Missouri from September 20-23, 1976. This conference was held under the joint sponsorship of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSO) and the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) (specifically, the Kansas City Region VII Office and the USOE Citizen Education Staff, a part of the Office of the Commissioner in Washington, D. C.).

The Conference Evaluation Model

The conference evaluation format utilized in this study was a simple systems analysis model (inputs, throughputs, outputs -- feedback process). The researchers attempted to learn as much about the conference prior to Kansas City as possible (i.e inputs such as conference objectives, participant selection procedures, conference organization, etc.). In preparation for the conference itself, an ongoing process-oriented evaluation scheme was designed to obtain perceptions on the conference from the perspectives of the participants, the conference leaders, and an evaluation team of participant-observers. Every major activity of the conference while in action (throughputs) was assessed, from registration and rooms to food and receptions and from major presentations to workgroups and special activities. Little happened publicly at the conference that the evaluators were not cognizant of sooner or later. The on-site evaluation was as thorough as resources, human energy, and ingenuity could produce within a limited time frame.

The Content of the Conference Evaluation Forms

The general report on this conference summarizes information obtained from a series of standardized questionnaires, namely:

1. Participant's Questionnaire Form #1, Part A, comprising 108 machine-scored questions with two to five choices for each question. The questions covered individual background; views on educational innovation; conference application proceedings (questions 1-34); participant's evaluation of meeting site; facilities and general arrangements (questions 35-65); participant's evaluation of the inputs and impact (outputs) of the meeting (questions 66-84); and the participant's evaluation of the teaching-learning environment (throughputs) for the meeting (questions 85-108).
2. Participant's Questionnaire, Form #1, Part B, an open-ended questionnaire of 27 items regarding the objectives of the conference, strong and weak points, suggestions for improvement, and impact of the meeting on proposed or future activities (outputs) in citizen education. In addition, separate open-ended questionnaires were prepared to assess other segments of the meeting; namely:
3. A Participant/Observer's Questionnaire, Form #2, utilized by the seven members of the conference evaluation team for nearly all principal events---some thirteen major presentations, seven work group sessions, and twenty-eight special activities sessions;

4. A Work Group Facilitator's/Host Recorder's Questionnaire, Form #3 and
5. A Resource Person's/Presenter's Questionnaire, Form #4.

The Evaluation Team's Activities at the Conference

As can be seen from the previously described format, the conference was critically examined from the point of view of the participants and the leaders of the conference. This, in addition to the presence of the evaluation team at all major presentations, almost all special activity sessions, and one-third of the work group sessions, allowed for nearly total coverage of the conference. The evaluation team members also observed and experienced all of the minor elements of the conference, such as registration proceedings, meeting room ambience, and public social interactions, while recording and evaluating group reactions to the conference at first hand.

No formal evaluation scheme could assess participant reactions to the frequent patriotic and religious rituals as well as personal observation of those reactions. The same was true in assessing the extent to which the conference pamphlet containing citizenship education objectives of the CCSO was ignored by participants, as was the lengthy resource book of readings on citizenship education prepared at considerable expense for the conference, but distributed only as participants arrived. Similarly, participant reactions (rebellion!) to using the Delphi technique to seek closure on citizen education task definition (what can be done?, sector responsibilities, corrective measures, etc.) could only be fathomed early in the conference through direct observation of these reactions. The evaluation team provided immediate feedback to the conference leadership (as did the work group facilitators and recorders) regarding group hostility toward the Delphi process; but it was allowed to stumble along toward an unfulfilled destiny. The conference evaluation model had provided for prior, ongoing, and follow-up activity with continual feedback but, in the instance of the Delphi process, this information was largely ignored by the conference leadership (which seemed tightly tied to the highly structured conference format as a whole). The Delphi was subsequently left to the work group leaders to handle as best they could.

Some Successes and Inadequacies of the Conference

The experience of this conference with the Delphi technique is only a single, microcosmic example of a macrocosmic problem which plagued the Kansas City Conference from beginning to end. That is, all observers, (participants, leaders, and evaluators) commented repeatedly on the strict and crowded time frame, the overstructured program, the inability to adjust or modify the format, and other restrictive or insensitive features of the conference. Time constraints, overstructuring, being talked at or being told to, and having too little opportunity for interaction and exchange were reactions heard all too frequently from this group of some 400 leaders in citizen education from different sectors of American society.

With all this said, however seemingly critical of certain segments of the meeting, the Kansas City conference was a qualified success in achieving its objectives. A national conference on citizen education, the first ever of such magnitude, was held. Key leaders in citizen education met for four days and interacted with one another, listened to experts in the field, and made contributions and commitments to a national effort in citizen education. Despite some of the problems mentioned previously, the participants worked long hours (from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.!) accomplishing about a week and one-half's work in a few days. Despite high attrition rates by the third day of the conference, participants stuck to their assigned tasks and produced committee reports which (however brief, cryptic or incomplete for the most part) provide the interested observer with some indices of what citizen education in the United States is, who is responsible for the process, when, where, how, and by whom this responsibility can be exercised, and partial answers to what the key age groups, sectors, goals, objectives, attitudes, skills, behaviors, and knowledges are in this important field of formal and non-formal education.

The Content of the Evaluation Report

This report covers six major aspects of the Kansas City conference: namely this introduction, in which we provide the reader with background information on citizen education and the first national conference (put in the perspective of other USOE sponsored national, regional, state and local conferences, workshops, and seminars), a general

description of the evaluation procedures, costs of the conference in
time and money, authorization and goal setting for the conference,
general and specific objectives and other background information which
puts the conference in proper context. We then proceed to the partici-
pants' views of the conference, describing who the participants were, (2)
where they came from, what were their backgrounds, what they said,
what they liked and did not like, and so forth. In this same section
of the report we discuss the strong and weak points of the conference,
suggestions for improving other conferences, and other products and
contributions from the participants such as the extent of their ongoing
commitments to civic, citizenship, and/or citizen education.

Next in order of presentation the evaluators focus on the leaders'
views of the conference, again summarizing strengths, weaknesses, (3)
and suggested improvements from their perspectives while generalizing
about their special evaluation of the conference objectives, the
presentations, the special activities, the work groups and other major
facets of the meeting. The next part of this study reports on the (4)
evaluation team's views of the conference, with a day by day, hour by
hour, blow by blow account of all activities (registration, meals,
receptions, presentations, special activities, and work groups)
including some impressionistic reactions, and those of other participants
to the conference mode, substance, and activities. The next two (5)(6)
segments of the report contain a list of conclusions and recommendations
about the conference including suggested improvements for other con-
ferences such as a looser conference format, more provision for
participant feedback, and modifications in the Delphi technique.

Finally, we conclude with a discussion of further analyses and follow-up activities, which makes the case for a more complete statistical analysis of these results; comparisons of the internal and external evaluation results; a follow-up contact with conference participants' evaluation of conference outputs, such as the Delphi results; revisions to the evaluation forms, and built in evaluation techniques for other conferences starting with the planning, goal definition, and implementation stages. The report also contains several Appendices which include copies of all evaluation forms used at the conference as well as abstracts of participant responses to selected key questions from Part B of the open-ended evaluation form.

Characteristics of Respondents to the Questionnaires and Sampling

As the reader of this report will learn, the Kansas City conference was not only well received by the largest group of participants (older, upper income, white males from the midwest, in educational/administrative positions at the local or state level) but also by other identifiable groups based on age, race, sex, region, etc.. These results report the findings from 182 completed questionnaires administered at the fifth work group discussion on the afternoon of the third day (Wednesday) of the conference (September 22 - 2:00-3:00 p.m.).

Based on visits to each of the work groups at that time, we estimate that returns from some three-fourths of those in active attendance at the fifth work group session were obtained at this time. The attrition rate observed for Wednesday evening and Thursday morning was so large that any additional delay in administering the questionnaire would have been disadvantageous to say the least. As it was, the questionnaires were not administered under the most favorable circumstances; and a few of the work groups (out of twenty) produced only one or a few returns. Most groups, however, had at least half of their numbers present and cooperating in the project.

Since the independent evaluation was not provided for in the formal schedule, some participants looked on the activity, much like the Delphi, as a further and unplanned intrusion on their time to be handled like the Delphi, in either in a cursory fashion or through avoidance behavior! Despite the fifty percent (of the total group) return rate, which is usually more than an adequate sample size, some qualification of these results must be mentioned. It may well be that the most rebellious and discontented did not respond to the survey, whereas the most polite, submissive, and contented did so in larger proportions than their real numbers at the conference.

Cross Validation of Survey Results and Follow-Up

In the absence of a follow-up questionnaire with a carefully drawn sampling and replacement scheme, the "submissive respondent" syndrome remains as a possible, if not probable, explanation of these overwhelmingly favorable results. Also of value for cross-validating external evaluation results will be their eventual comparisons with the results obtained at Kansas City from the USOE regional office internal evaluation at the pre-conference and conference end points. This external/internal comparison, covering numbers of returns, objectives, strengths and weaknesses, work and special activity assessment, expectations and personal observations of the conference participants, and their commitment to citizen education should prove instructive.

Utility of the Conference Evaluation Report

With all this said, this evaluation effort provides a model for other USOE sponsored conferences, workshops, and seminars. The results reported provide an interesting baseline for later analysis and comparisons with other citizen education conferences. The forms produced and techniques employed are also of use to other conference evaluators in the private or public sectors. The practical experience gained by the evaluation team (which is summarized throughout this report) should also prove of value to future evaluators.

Authorization and Goal Setting for the Conference

The USOE commitment to civic education is long standing and of considerable importance. Since the 1950's, different government-sponsored programs have spent millions in federal funds toward improving citizenship through NDEA civics teacher training institutes and Triple T programs for training teachers and teacher trainers in political and social studies. However, the USOE citizen education effort is more recent in its conception, less expensive in its projected costs, more ambitious in its objectives, and more oblique or indirect in its approach to this area of national concern.

In December 1975 a meeting in Washington, D. C. was held (at the request of HEW Secretary David Mathews) to bring together a group of scholars, practitioners, governmental officials, and other educational specialists to explore the topic of policy-making concerns in the area of citizenship education. This small group contained, among others, HEW/USOE representatives, staff members of professional scholarly organizations, political scientists and educators, curriculum specialists, private foundation spokesmen, and state department of education officials. Various views on citizen education were then exchanged (including a paper by Dr. Mathews) regarding the appropriate role of the federal government in the enterprise; the significance of the task for citizen apathy and disillusionment; the complex role of education in fostering everything including civic morality and responsibility; civic education as a realistic process of experience, participation, and involvement, and the difficulties of language, terminology, and formal concepts in the field. Other themes emerging from this meeting had to do with the historical threads of national purpose which are evident in citizenship education; the non-formal aspects of education for civic responsibility; and the potentially radical implications of teaching democracy, ethics, participation and democracy throughout a society founded on the republican principle of indirect governance.

Subsequent to this meeting other papers were produced and speeches delivered by Commissioner T. H. Bell ("Citizen Responsibility For the Common Good," Conference on Citizen Involvement, Governor's Steering Committee on Education, St. Louis, Missouri, May 4, 1976) and Mr. Logan Sallada, Policy Advisor to the Commissioner ("Key Issues and Problems In Developing New National Policy Directions in Citizenship Education," Conference of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D. C., May 1976). The Committee on Citizenship Education of the Council of Chief State School Officers also produced a paper in 1976 on "Effective Citizenship Education: A Basic Goal of Education in the United States, and the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association (APSA) frequently issued reports and ran articles in the APSA's Division of Educational Affairs' publication, DEA News, on the subjects of political socialization and education at the elementary, secondary, and college/university levels.

These reports, papers, and speeches either described the operations of the new Citizen Education Staff of the USOE, or the citizen participation model programs which were operating out of the HEW Secretary's office, or contributed to the on-going dialogue regarding political education which had as one subject of discourse the need for national and other conferences on the subject of citizen education. These papers and other documents also described basic goals of citizen education, as well as the characteristics of citizenship in the United States. Basic questions were also posed such as: What are the responsibilities and rights of a citizen? What are the crucial problem areas of American society? Whose responsibility is it to educate for citizenship? and the like.

While all of these activities were proceeding, a group of policy advisors for citizen education began to meet regularly to discuss the above-mentioned questions and to plan a scheme for a citizen education forum for a two-year period. This group, which included several persons* mentioned elsewhere in this report, also began to plan for the first national conference on citizenship and education. With the Citizen Education Staff and the HEW Secretary's office, it was agreed that citizen education could be defined as follows:

1. a policy term and a continuing process
2. something which occurs at all educational levels, formal and non-formal
3. something other than, or in addition to, traditional subjects such as civics, American government, international relations or problems of democracy courses
4. a topic which had emerging aspects in the new social studies, e.g., political participation, global perspectives, multi-cultural, family and law related, economics, ethical/moral, and environmental education.
5. Some key sectors of American society (e.g., home, community, education, mass media, government, etc.) were involved in the process.

Citizen education, broadly defined, was not a new course or a new curriculum. In addition to these factors, a policy-making process/plan involving the USOE was developed with a strategy for the 1976-78 period having national and regional conferences, state seminars, local voluntary organizations and exemplary workshops, and an ongoing seminar.

---

*(e.g., Professor Badi Foster, Dr. Harrison Fox, Professor R. Freeman Butts, Dr. Sheila Koeppen of the APSA, and others.)

Assignment of responsibilities placed citizen-participation demonstration projects in the HEW Secretary's office, and the remainder of the activities with the Citizen Education Staff. The funding for all of these efforts came from the HEW Secretary's and U.S. Commissioner's offices.

In consultation with the USOE regional office in Kansas City and the CCSO, it was decided to hold the first national conference in Kansas City. The overall conference format was jointly planned between the Washington and Kansas City USOE staffs. The Kansas City office, working closely with the CCSO and other professional organizations, sought nominations of significant individuals interested or involved in citizen education throughout the country. More than 2,000 persons were nominated and invited to attend the first national conference. The important features of site selection, invitations of speakers and participants, production of a conference resource book, printing of a program, etc. were left to the Kansas City office with input from the Citizen Education Staff. Money was transferred (some $125,000) from Washington to Kansas City to pay for the basic elements (papers, programs, travel expenses, etc.) of the conference.

The Kansas City USOE regional office and the Citizen Education Staff agreed to the basic format of the conference including the basic conference topics and speeches, special activities, work groups, the Delphi process, etc. Two separate evaluation efforts, internal and external, were discussed but no pre-conference agreement was reached on these procedures. The Citizen Education Staff also had certain basic objectives in mind which were of a national magnitude, such as tying the project to the National Assessment of Educational Progress in Citizenship and Social Studies and producing a strategy for citizen education for a two-year period including a network of contacts and a series of other meetings. The Kansas City regional office, however, had more limited objectives in mind which were directly tied to producing an effective conference and only indirectly or incidentally linked with the overall scheme for other meetings, seminars, and workshops throughout the country.

The descriptive leaflet distributed with invitations from the Kansas City regional office defined conference objectives as follows:

> "Representatives of the home, school, church, labor, business and government will review and consider issues affecting the citizen in society; issues affecting the process of citizen education; problems and deficiencies in current citizenship activities; and finally suggest what ought to be done in citizenship education. The conference findings will be used to develop additional dialogue among the decision-makers and other interested citizens at regional and state conferences scheduled from September, 1976 through June, 1977."

This definition set forth six objectives; namely:

1. input from six key sectors of American society
2. review and consideration of issues affecting citizens
3. review and consideration of issues affecting citizen education
4. review and consideration of problems and deficiences in

citizenship activities

5. recommendations for action

6. production of findings useful for subsequent conferences.

It is of some significance that despite the logical progression in this list of objectives from inputs (e.g. six sectors...etc.) to throughputs (review...etc.) to outputs (recommendations...and production... etc.), the last mentioned objectives had to do with distribution of the findings and their use at other meetings. As it was, as we shall say below, the sector input was unrepresentative, the review processes mentioned were incomplete, and the conference output and utility for other meetings were either nonexistent, of doubtful value, or part of a post-conference salvage operation now in process at Kansas City (for the internal evaluation results and speaker's papers) or in Washington (for the Delphi and work group reports).

As we can see from this description of the goal setting and authorization segments which preceded this conference, the divided responsibility and conflicts in objectives which characterized much of the pre-conference planning period came to fruition in Kansas City from September 20-23. A description of just what happened there is the common theme for the remaining sections of this report.

II. THE PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS OF THE CONFERENCE

A. Questionnaire Results: Part A

One hundred eighty-two persons completed the 108 questions contained in Part A of the participants' questionnaire. Part A was divided into six sections (see Appendix I); namely: I. Background, views on educational innovators, and conference application procedures (questions 1 to 34); II. The meeting site, facilities and general arrangements (questions 34-47); III. The conference program (questions 48-65); IV. Other conference inputs (questions 66-71); V. The impact of this meeting (questions 72-84); and VI. The teaching-learning environment (questions 85-108).

All of Part A was answered with a common questionnaire using an IBM mark-sensing card and electrographic pencil for machine-scoring purposes. The cards were subjected to statistical analysis using a computer. Frequency distributions, percentages of responses, and cross tabulations between critical independent (33 background questions) and dependent (six separate conference evaluation subscores) variables were produced. A summary of the percentage distribution for Part A (including numbers$>$10% of omits) is presented below (see Appendix I). These results generally indicate that most of the participants were quite pleased with the conference as a whole, although certain aspects of the meeting were not satisfactory; e.g. imposition of the Delphi technique, inadequate time for rest and relaxation, overscheduling of the conference, and scant attention to non-educational sectors. Each of these sections of the survey form will be treated separately below.

General Numbers and Characteristics of Participants

On the participant roster distributed toward the end of the conference in Kansas City, there were approximately 400 full and part-time participants, including major speakers, resource persons, short-term participants, leaders of special activities, USOE and conference staff persons, and others who went throughthe registration procedures or were cleared through the registration desk. This number also included those who pre-registered for the conference and were expected to attend, but did not, as well as those who were in attendance for one or two sessions or for one day or one night. A fair estimate of the largest single number of full-time, active, and working conference participants is somewhere in the range of 350-360 persons.

The lists of special activity participants (which included those who pre-registered, whether or not they came) indicate some 470 participants. The list of work group participants numbers some 400 names (again listing those who pre-registered, whether or not they came, as well as conference speakers). Our best estimate of the actual number of participants (based on spot checks, participant-observer reports, and work group leaders' reports) is an average of some 300 active working members throughout the conference. At the time that the external conference evaluation form was distributed (during work group session #5 on Wednesday afternoon, third day of the conference), personal visits to all twenty work groups indicated a number closer to some 240 active participants. In that context, the return of 182 usable questionnaires, representing three-fourths of the active participants at that time, is more than adequate.

Again examining the conference roster, we find that some 20% (N = 77) were listed as Doctor or Professor, with no other titles being so conspicuous. The sector representatives on the roster were as follows: Labor: 4 (1%); Home: 41 (10%); Government: 55 (14%); Business: 46 (11%); Religion: 15 (4%); and School: 240 (60%). Those from government were mostly federal and state government bureaucrats and administrators. From business, individuals came from newspapers; foundations; research, consulting, and educational publishing groups; and state departments or chambers of commerce. The labor group was hard to identify as such, with few listed, for example, as UAW. Those from the religious sector could only be identified by titles such as Father, Sister, Brother, or Reverend. The school sector was composed of professional organization representatives, government workers, and non-profit and foundation representatives, with large proportions of their numbers from colleges, universities, and state departments of education. Those from the home were also frequently miscategorized, as was the education sector, with people from research organizations, college and university teachers, public school persons, librarians, study center and HEW personnel appearing in this catch-all category. With these general impressions in mind, let us now examine the characteristics of the respondents to our survey questionnaires.

Participant's Background, Views on Educational Innovators, and Conference Application Procedures.

It is interesting to note at the outset that five percent of the participants believed themselves to be attending something other than a national conference. Most participants were from the Midwest (48%) or Northeast (25%) and from large cities or metropolitan areas (74%). The group was two-thirds male, with two-thirds both over forty years of age and from an educational organization. Seventeen percent identified themselves as from a governmental organization, three percent from the religious sector, seven percent from business or voluntary community organizations or foundations. Some twelve persons in the survey also categorized themselves as representing the home, four from labor, one from agriculture, seven from media, and one from the health area. These percentages are roughly similar to those discussed above.

Most of the participants (57%) provide their services for others at the state or local level, but others supply them in a national (26%) or regional (10%) context, with five percent doing so internationally. Nearly three-fourths of the participants are in administration (53%) or teaching (21%); and over half (54%) have been involved in educational work for more than sixteen years. Those who are administrators generally work with staffs of fewer than ten persons.

Of the entire group, over two-thirds are familiar with new citizen education programs, plans, or studies currently underway; and an equal number have been primarily responsible for initiating new plans, programs, or studies in citizen education. This group also believes that the two key categories at the local level for actual educational change and real innovation in the citizen education field are teachers and school principals/administrators (67%). At the college and university level, the teachers and professors, as well as individual departments and disciplines (61%), receive the nod for such innovation, as do chief state school officers and state subject-matter supervisors (65%) at the state level. The respondents also believe that three key groups are most responsible for educational innovation in the United States today; namely, educational (49%); governmental (22%); and private, non-profit organizations and foundations (22%). The least influential groups for such change, according to respondents, are religious (43%) and business, labor, or agricultural (37%) groups.

The individual participants also believe that they are either moderately or very significant (63%) as key agents in citizen educational change at the local, state, or national level. About half believe that other participants are moderately or somewhat significant in this role. Over half of the group has had quite a bit or very much involvement in the citizen education field and the same number has had some, quite a bit, or very much involvement with the sponsoring organizations for this meeting.

People came to this conference for two primary reasons --- because they were interested in citizen education (42%) or because they were invited to attend (33%). Some twenty percent, however, came because it was part of their job. Most heard about the conference through an invitation from the conference sponsors. The most important reasons (60%) for people attending this conference were to engage in give-and-take experiences with experts and to meet and talk with others interested in citizen education, rather than to obtain factual information, to help with their professional growth, or to learn about new approaches to teaching and learning in citizen education.

Nearly eighty percent of the conferees identify themselves as being upper or upper middle class, fifty-nine percent are Protestant, fifteen percent Catholic, and ten percent Jewish. Eighty-eight percent are White, seven percent Black/Negro, three percent Hispanic, and two percent are Asian/Pacific Islander or American Indian/Alaskan native. The two largest political categories chosen by the respondents for self-ascription were liberal (48%) or middle-of-the-road (35%).

Nearly eighty percent of attendees believe that a nationwide reform in citizen education is necessary and point to the need for political participation (54%), global perspectives (17%) and ethnic/multi-cultural education (15%) as key study areas in citizen education. When given another choice of option, the valuative, ethical and moral education field (50%) also joins this list, with law and family related and social science or behavioral studies sharing the remainder of the support. The participants as a whole also believe in approaching curriculum reform in citizen education through traditional political studies areas (such as civics, American government, problems of democracy, and international relations courses) as well as social studies and interdisciplinary courses (80%).

A Composite Sketch of an "Average" Conferee

Based on the overall characteristics of the conferees at Kansas City in September 1976, the "typical" participant had the following general attributes: He was white, over-forty, Protestant, male, from the midwest, working for over sixteen years as a local or state educational administrator with supervisory responsibilities for fewer than ten persons. He characterized himself as being upper-middle-class and liberal or middle-of-the-road politically. He had frequent contact with citizen education as a field and was both familiar with new citizen education programs and recently involved in implementing a new program in the field. This is consistent with his view of being a significant change agent in citizen education. The average participant believed his fellow conferees were also significant in this respect, but less so. He also maintained that the best route to local, state, college and university, and national change in citizen education is, respectively, through teachers and administrators, chief state school officers and state social studies supervisors, professors and their departments, and local educational authorities. Educational organizations were viewed as most influential in educational change and religious organizations least important.

The average participant had had previous contact with the sponsoring organizations for the meeting and he came because he was invited to come, was interested in citizen education, and wanted to meet, talk, and exchange ideas with others, including experts, in the field. He believed, as did most others, that a nationwide reform in citizen education was necessary, particularly in the areas of political participation and value/moral/ethical education. However, he also believed this reform should come through the typical political education and social studies courses now offered in the schools.

The Conference Meeting Site, Facilities and General Arrangements.

Nearly all participants were satisfied with the dates, meeting site, facilities, accommodations, meal times and breaks for the conference. This level of satisfaction was also true with respect to the system for general communication at the meeting and the meeting rooms. However, significant numbers wanted longer breaks (22%) and were unhappy with the communications system (32%). Large majorities of the participants were unable to establish informal contacts at the meeting (65%), found no time for relaxation or socializing (93%), and were not satisfied with the organization and scheduling of the conference (54%). These loyal participants attended three-fourths or more of the conference activities (88%) and were active participants in group discussions (91%). Most significantly, eighty-five percent of the conferees found the Kansas City meeting to have been valuable to them personally.

The Conference Program, Registration, and Receptions.

Little fault was found with the conference registration procedures and "no host" receptions. This was also true with respect to the formal presentations through Wednesday afternoon. The most highly rated of these speeches was that by Professor R. Freeman Butts on "An Historical Perspective of Citizen Education," which was rated "excellent" or "above average" by seventy-two percent of the participants.

By Wednesday afternoon, the participants had heard seven presentations. However, the conference evaluation form was unable accurately to assess all seven of these presentations because of the incomplete or inaccurate information available at the USOE in Washington, D. C., through Friday, September 17, three days prior to the conference.

Ideally, the day, date, time, time, title, and name of the speaker in correct order of presentation should be provided to the evaluator in advance, so that questionnaires can be devised to provide an accurate assessment of its impact. Since this information was lacking prior to the conference, the only route available for a total conference view of the ten major presentations, as well as other speeches, would be through a conference follow-up questionnaire. Reaction to these specific presentations is covered in Part B of this Section and below in Section IV of this report. We have some indication of participants' overall reactions to the presentations. Fifty-eight percent of those responding rated them as being "excellent" or "above average." However, the specific worth of each effort will remain something of an open question until more solid information is available.

As we have just mentioned, the presentations were highly rated by over half of the conferees. An equal number similarly rated the special activities, although more in that group rated them "excellent." The work groups, showing slighly over half "above average" or "excellent" ratings, present a different problem. The work group evaluations indicate a larger "excellent" rating than the presentations, although less than the seven special activities; but they also received the highest "below average" ratings. This indicates that the work groups were a mixed bag, depending on the characteristics of the group leadership, participants, group process, and other variables. Some insight is also available into these factors in Part B of this section and in Section IV of this report; but again a follow-up questionnaire would be necessary to focus on what benefits the participants derived from the most successful and what was lacking in the least successful work groups.

One other observation is also relevant in evaluating program activities; that is, one of the evaluation questions referred to the Delphi survey. (All program items were listed since a reasonable plan for administering the evaluation was arranged only when the meeting was half-over.) Although most participants did not respond to this question, the vehemence and antipathy felt toward the Delphi process was signalled by the fact that over half of the respondents rated the process as "below average" or "poor." More will be said on this matter immediately below as well as in section VI of this report.

Other Conference Inputs: Objectives, Resource Materials, and the Delphi.

Most participants were satisfied with the displays of curriculum material and the pre-conference information; but a sizeable number (27%) wanted better information prior to the conference. Perhaps even more important is the fact that forty-two percent of the participants were not satisfied at this point in the conference with the definition provided by the leadership for the purposes and objectives of the conference. Large numbers (56%-68%) were also unhappy with the use of the Delphi instrument before, during, and toward the end of the meeting, and the most hostility was registered regarding its use in-session.

Conference Impact: By Sector, Government Level, Problem Areas, and Reformulation of Citizen Education.

Thirteen separate questions were asked about the impact of the conference on eight sectors of American society, three governmental levels, the crucial problem areas, and the production of a necessary, practical, and desirable plan for the reformulation and regeneration of citizen education for the present and future. Again keeping in mind that this assessment took place two-thirds of the way through the meeting, rather than at the end, we can see that large numbers - from 45% to 75% - believed that the conference had not properly addressed citizen education in the religious, business/industry, labor, voluntary organization, agriculture, and local and state government areas. Nearly all agreed that the school and citizen education had been effectively approached; and the large majority (65%-74%) also believed that the home and community, federal government, and mass media had been adequately covered, as had the crucial problem areas. Perhaps even more significant, in terms of the ambitious conference objectives, however, is the fact that nearly half of the participants did not believe that a new plan for civic education was produced at the conference.

The Teaching/Learning Environment.

This section of the questionnaire dealt with the conference as a general educational experience - with matters such as the participants' views of the conference leaders as teachers, the value of group discussions, personal motivation, and the conference materials and processes. Participants indicated that they had assumed personal responsibility for making the conference as productive as possible. Other highly scored items were the subject matter knowledge of the leadership, the stimulation and motivation provided, the favorable learning atmosphere, the value of the presentations, and the skill of the conference leaders in speaking, organizing, explaining, answering questions, and interacting with the participants in a fair, impartial, tolerant, sensitive, and jovial fashion.

At the other extreme, however, the conference and its leadership were rated much lower in the extent to which the conference duplicated other meetings (however, this question may be defective because of phrasing), the unwillingness of the leadership to adjust the meeting to the expressed needs and interests of the participants, and one major defect of the meeting in terms of its logical, meaningful, and developmental sequence. Certain problems were also noted with respect to the group discussions, in that over one-fourth of the participants rated these groups as "below average" or "poor" and some twenty percent were not pleased with the group facilitators or host/recorders. Another aspect of the conference which did not receive high or passing grades was the conference reading book and other printed/duplicated material at the meeting. Nearly one-third of the respondents rated this material "low," as they did the extent to which the conference balanced concerns for theory and application. Significant numbers (19%-20%) also wished to have more informal contacts with the group leadership before and after the formal sessions.

Summary of the Average Participant's Evaluation of the Conference.

The average participant was satisfied with the conference site, dates, meeting facilities, communications system, accommodations, meals, and breaks. He was not satisfied with the overscheduling and rigid time frame for the meeting, however, and wanted more time for rest, relaxation, informal contacts, and socializing. He was a faithful attendant at nearly all conference meetings and believed the meeting was of personal value to him. He also believed the registration procedures, receptions, presentations, work groups, and special activities were of value. He was not at all pleased with the use of the Delphi technique and he was unclear about the objectives of the conference. He also thought that the conference adequately addressed home, school, mass media, and federal responsibilities in citizen education, as well as the crucial problem areas. But this was not the case with respect to religion, business, labor, agriculture, voluntary organizations, or local and state government areas. Perhaps the biggest disappointment to the average conferee was that a "game plan" for citizen education did not unfold during the meeting. The average participant also believed that he had made a personal contribution to the success of the conference. He was stimulated and motivated by the presentations and the pleasant learning environment and was impressed with the subject matter knowledge of the conference leaders as well as with their other teaching skills and personality characteristics.

This composite view of the typical participant's reaction to the conference must also be qualified in the sense that it reflects his opinion at that one point in time two-thirds of the way through the conference. Thus, it may suggest but does not reflect his final opinion. Only a follow-up evaluation would provide us with this information about what the participant has done in the citizen education field as a direct result of this meeting. Moreover, the majority view does not adequately reflect the views of significant minorities (each such minority represented at least 20% of the respondents at this conference) who were not satisfied and who believed that the meeting site, facilities, and general arrangments could have been improved and deficiences corrected (46%), that the breaks were inadequate (29%), or that the communications system needed improvement (32%). The large minority who were not satisfied with certain presentations also deserve a hearing, as do those who wanted better pre-conference information, better work groups, more informal contacts with an improved leadership, better use of printed conference materials, and a better balance between theoretical and practical matters in citizen education.

Cross Tabulation Results

A fairly elaborate computer cross tabulation between certain of the first thirty-four background or independent variables (region, age, sex, occupation, ethnic group, etc.) in the questionnaire and six composite or dependent variables (i.e. question 45 - value of the conference; questions 49 to 55 - conference program; questions 63 to 65 - presentations, work groups, and special activities; questions 72 to 84 - sectors, government levels, problem areas, and civic education reform; and questions 85 to 108 - the teaching/learning environment) produced 135 separate tables comparing five different high and low ratings with the two to five different response categories (e.g., male/female or northeast, southeast, midwest, northwest, or southwest). Chi square (X^2) was also computed to compare the significance levels of expected and observed results and the degree to which they were within a reasonable level of not being chance results. (The .05 level or above indicates the observed results have only a five in one-hundred possibility of occurring by chance whereas for the .001 confidence level there is one chance in a thousand the observed results will occur by chance. The .05 or 95% level is the usually expected criterion in educational and social science measurement.)

Since space and time restrictions do not permit a thorough examination or a complete discussion of all of these results, we have merely analyzed what is perhaps the most important dependent variable; that is, item 45 - value of the conference to the individual participant. By comparing twenty-three selected background variables (e.g. religion, sex, age, etc.) with one's estimate of the personal value of the conference, we find that half of the items did not indicate significant differences. The other half varied in significance levels from .05 to .001.

Region of the country, type of educational work, work responsibilities, initiation of, or familiarity with, citizen education reform, personal significance of oneself as a change agent, selection of influential organizations for change, reason for attending the conference, need for reform of citizen education, and selection of a crucial study area were not significantly different from chance responses in terms of estimating the personal value of the conference to the participant. However, the population of one's work area, sex, age, type of organization, years in education, ascription of responsibility for change, estimate of the significance of others, previous contact with civic education and the conference sponsors, ethnicity, and identification of one key study area were at an acceptable level of significance (λ.05) to warrant further statistical analysis.

For example, these cross tabulations indicate that the following types of persons expressed disappointment or reservations with the value of the conference to them: those from large metropolitan areas, whites, males, persons between the ages of 30 and 50 years, educators in the field from six to ten years (and over twenty years), those who believe that local educational agencies are most responsible for citizen education reform, those who either think their fellow participants are moderately significant (or who cannot estimate their significance) as change agents, those who have had quite a bit of (or very much) contact with citizen education and very little (or just some) contact with the sponsoring organization, and who identify the evaluative,ethical, and moral study area as being most crucial for the future success of citizen education in the United States.

Only an additional and more sophisticated statistical treatment, such as a multiple regression analysis, of these results would help us to determine which combination of background variables best explain subscores such as the teaching/learning environment. However, these cross tabulations allow us to hypothesize that there is a pattern of evaluative response levels which is statistically and significantly associated with certain interest areas - such as the moral/ethical study area, in that persons most involved in such areas were least satisfied with the conference. Any more complete discussion of these dimensions will have to await further statistical analysis of the results, such as a factor analysis of the teaching/learning subscore which would allow us to sort out those few and essential educational elements which underlay this conference and its general successes.

B. Questionnaire Results: Part B

An open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix II) of six pages with twenty-seven separate questions asked participants about how long it took them to complete both questionnaires, their names and addresses (optional), the major objectives of the conference, strongest and weakest points, suggestions for improvements, expectations, willingness to participate in other citizen education activities, and their evaluation of the evaluation process itself. Despite the fact that all participants present at the fifth work group session received copies of this form, only about half (N = 87) of those who completed Part I returned the form by mail. This figure is about one-third of those present at that work group session and over one-fourth of the number of active conference participants. (See Appendices VI, VII, and VIII on categorization and listing of participant responses, such as willingness to participate in the future civic education activities and strongest points of the meeting.)

Question 6b. asked: "What sector do you represent? (Check one)"

The question identified eleven sectors and provided space to check Other ______(Please specify).

All 87 participants who completed Part B responded to this question by checking at least one sector. Five of them checked two - with "Education" one of the choices in each instance. Four of the eleven sectors were not represented: Labor, Media, Health, and Agriculture. No one indicated "Other."

Sector representation among respondents to Part B correlates quite closely with the representation indicated on the participant list and from machine-coded responses to Questions 6 and 7, Part A, as charted below:

	PART B		CONFERENCE LIST	PART A
	N	PERCENT	PERCENT	PERCENT
Home.	8	9%	10%	-
Education	55	64	60	66%
Religion	2	2	4	3
Business and industry. . .	2	2	11	7
Government	15	17	14	17
Voluntary community organization . . .	4	5	-	-
Foundation	1	1	-	7
Labor	-	-	1	-
	87	100%	100%	100%

Questions 1b and 26b asked how many minutes it took for participants to complete Part A and Part B. An analysis of these responses indicates that the average time for Part A was 28 minutes and for Part B, 27 minutes. Most participants spent from 20 to 30 minutes on each of the forms. Question 5b asked what role/function the respondent played at the conference with the following results: participant - 58; resource person - 1; presenter - 11; reporter - 9; discussion/work group leader - 5. Three persons did not reply and no one indicated he or she was a staff member despite the fact that some USOE staff responded, but chose to identify themselves with other conference roles.

Question 8b. asked: "What were the major objectives of this meeting as you perceived them?"

In responding to question 8b., participants revealed ten different categories of perception, or ways of looking at conference objectives:

- To exchange information on citizen education by imparting it, by learning it, and by sharing it.
- To establish the need for citizen education.
- To promote understanding of citizen education.
- To consider goals and priorities for citizen education.
- To discuss implementation of citizen education.
- To address problems of citizen education.
- To improve citizen education.
- To review the current status of citizen education.
- To set up action networks for citizen education.
- To promote citizen education awareness and action

Question 10b. asked: "What were the weakest points of this meeting?" A summary of responses follows.

STRUCTURE. The conference was too rigorously structured, with particular regard to program scheduling and the work group process.

Scheduling.
- The work day was too long and too full.
- There was almost no free time for relaxation, recreation, "visiting," and informal discussion.

Work Group Process. The Delphi process proved counterproductive as implemented in the work group sessions.
- There was too much "process," with too much paperwork.
- Critical problems were not adequately addressed.

RECRUITMENT. The invitation process was faulty as to participants, presenters, and work group facilitators.

Participants.
- There were too many representatives of the "education" sector.
- Women, minorities, and special interests were underrepresented.

Presenters. Some of the presenters failed to address the topics assigned to them.

Facilitators. Some of the facilitators managed their work groups poorly.

COMMUNICATIONS. Information-exchange processes were inadequate before and during the conference.

Participant Orientation.
- Conference and work group objectives were not clear.
- The pre-planned process for attaining conference objectives was never adequately explained, with particular reference to the Delphi

Cross-Communications. There was insufficient sharing of information among concurrent sessions.

As one example of a participant's own detailed, thoughtful, and quite complete answer to this question the following verbatim reply is presented:

"10b. What were the weakest points of this meeting? (continued)

Lack of clear objectives. The objectives for the meeting were not clearly stated and made known to all participants before the conference. Hence, many people had no clear sense of why they were invited to the meeting nor what the meeting was really about. This seemed to be especially true of many of the non-school people at the meeting. Lack of a clear sense of purpose made it difficult for people to contribute efficiently to the progress of the meeting.

Over-organization. The agenda for the meeting was overly organized and did not allow sufficient time for informal interaction among the participants. This was perhaps the single biggest problem at the meeting. The people felt pushed and rushed. Participants had no time to renew old acquaintances, make new ones and profit from the informal but important exchanges of ideas and information which usually takes place at conferences of this type. In addition, the extremely tight--even ridiculous--scheduling led to resentment on the part of many participants. People felt they were being treated as children whose every minute had to be scheduled and supervised. As a result, many of the participants were much less productive than they might have been had the schedule been more realistic.

Inappropriate use of the Delphi technique. The Delphi questionnaires administered prior to and during the meeting were grossly misused. From a technical standpoint, the Delphi instruments used were not well constructed and any evidence gained from them cannot be considered reliable or valid. In addition, as they were used and constructed the Delphi instruments offered no real common ground for discussion among various participants. Early on many participants began to develop strong negative reactions to both the content of the Delphi instruments and to the manner in which they were administered in small group sessions. Again, people felt as if they were being treated like children. In addition, the artificiality of the content of the Delphi instrument soon became apparent and caused considerable resentment among most participants. The prevalent attitude at the conference soon became, "we'll fill these out if you demand it but we think they're a waste of time."

Inappropriate recruitment techniques. Shortly after the meeting began it became apparent that many of the non-academic participants had been invited to the meeting simply because their name appeared one or another organizational mailing list. While many of these people were sympathetic to citizen education, they had no background or real interest in the area. They had come to the meeting either because they were ordered to do so by a superior in their organization or simply because of some uninformed but sincere sense of obligation. What was missing were community leaders and citizens actually involved in various sorts of civic and community projects While it is not easy to identify such people on a national scale, the meeting could have greatly profited from the experience and insight of such citizens."

Question 11b. asked: "How could meetings such as this be improved in the future?"

Six major recommendations emerge from analysis of the responses to this question:

1. Improve advance preparations for the conference:
    - by clarifying objectives and the plan of action for achieving them.
    - by assigning "homework".
2. Schedule the agenda loosely.
    - Allow some free time.
    - Allow time for participant interaction, both formal and informal.
3. See that presenters address their assigned topics.
4. Broaden the base of participation, to make the roster of participants more representative of a cross-section of American society.
5. Devise a more productive process for the work groups.
6. Arrange for cross-communication among various conference activities - and particularly, among concurrent sessions.

Question 16b. asked: "Would you be willing to participate in an on-going effort in the near future for citizen education? ____Yes ____No _____Do Not Know Explain: ________" (See Appendix VI)

Of the 87 respondents, one entered NA (not applicable). The others divided as follows:

Yes	75
No	1
Do Not Know	10
	86

Twenty-three respondents checked "Yes" and added qualifying comments. Those comments indicated:

Enthusiasm	9 respondents
Importance of the subject	6
Time constraints	3
Willingness to participate	2 (locally: 1; regionally: 1)
Desire for clearer goal orientation	2
As continuation of pre-existing professional activity	2
Despite negative reaction to conference	2
	26

The total number of responses exceeds 23 because some of the answers incorporate more than one concept.

No. The "No" response derived from negative reaction to the conference, but did not close the door to future participation under conditions deemed more favorable.

Do Not Know. All ten respondents who checked "Do Not Know" added qualifying comments; and all of the comments suggested minds open to the possibility of future participation under favorable circumstances.

Five of the respondents mentioned time constraints.

Three others spoke in terms of personal competence and external conditions in a combination which would favor their making a useful contribution.

Question 27b asked: "Could this evaluation procedure be improved?" (Please explain)

About half the respondents did not reply to this question. Of those that did, about half said "no" or "probably yes" and the remainder offered suggestions. By far, the most frequently heard complaints were that: the procedure was too long and time consuming; had errors in the listings of activities; repeated what had been asked; had some irrelevant general questions such as those on the teaching/ learning environment. On the other hand, many respondents were quite pleased with this opportunity to evaluate the event and expressed hope that their contribution to the effort would be heard and acted upon. Many also took this opportunity to repeat their good feelings about the conference in general and citizen education in particular. Many of these suggested improvements in the evaluation process will be implemented in any future efforts in this area.

Summary of Part B Results

Time and space restrictions do not permit us either to summarize or list all of the responses to all of the questions in Part B of the evaluation form. The eight illustrative questions treated in some detail above indicate that the average respondent was representative of the conference group as a whole, spent less than one hour evaluating the conference, and had his or her own conception of the objectives of the conference, which differed with the person and with those of the conference planners. The most important of these objectives seem to be the information exchange and citizen education process goals.

The average respondent was pleased with most of the presenters and special activities and rated his interaction with fellow participants highly. But the structure, recruitment, and communications difficulties detracted from his effectiveness as a participant. Suggested improvements again have to do with improving clarification of conference objectives, loosening the schedule, and providing for better interaction and participation. Most significant is the fact that the overwhelming majority of respondents is willing to participate in future citizen education efforts, with some qualifications and preconditions. Finally, the responses to question 27b indicated that the external evaluation, although lengthy and time consuming, was a valuable asset to the conference.

III. THE LEADERS' VIEWS OF THE CONFERENCE: WORK GROUPS, SPECIAL ACTIVITIES, RESOURCES, AND PRESENTATIONS

A. Facilitators, Hosts, and Their Work Groups.

The work group facilitators and host/recorders were given a separate evaluation form (see Appendix III). There were forty such forms distributed and twenty were returned. This represented one-half of the total number of facilitators and hosts and two-thirds, or fourteen, of the twenty work groups. Most of the leadership (N $\doteq$ 13) were from the educational sector or from government (N = 6).

Major Group Objectives

These conference leaders identified four major groups of objectives for their groups, as follows: 1. To discuss group concerns regarding citizen education problems and to encourage sharing of experiences and participation in the group;* 2. To refine the key problems facing society and citizen education, to make recommendations, and to design a realistic strategy for meeting these problem areas;* 3. To rank the issue/problem areas, to work with the Delphi survey, and to respond to stated problems and tasks;* and 4. To produce a synthesis and definition of a citizen, good citizenship, citizen education, and its objectives.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

Relationship Between Group and Conference Objectives

Various views were expressed by the group leaders as to the relationship between their group and the conference as a whole. However, most saw the two as closely interrelated* and only a few observed any discontinuity between the stated tasks and the needs of the group. Some mention was made here of time constraints on the group process or the baneful influences of overstructuring or use of the Delphi process.

Achievement of Objectives

Most of the leaders acknowledged that the group's objectives were achieved* in that the assigned tasks (e.g. the Delphi survey) were completed and group dialogue centered on problem areas, citizenship for the future, and outcomes of citizen education. Several leaders also indicated that the groups largely ignored or treated their assigned tasks superficially and then got down to constructive discussion of citizenship, problem areas, the tasks of citizen education, sector responsibility, and major outcomes for citizen education. As a whole, it seemed as though most groups faltered initially and within a day began functioning effectively.

Objectives Not Achieved

This section of the questionnaire allowed the leaders to express their disappointments with the group process. Here there appeared a scattering of responses which included the following: Lack of time or too much overstructuring for group interaction;* consternation with the Delphi process and the problem areas there denoted as being nebulous, unclear or undefined;* frustration that certain responsibilities were never faced or were encountered too late in the group* e.g., definition of problem areas and citizen education goals, problem solving, recommendations for citizen education, and assignment of sector responsibility. Other comments from leaders worthy of some mention were that the groups were too WASP-oriented to cope with the realities of citizen education or that the educators and government people could not intelligently discuss other sectors. Still other leaders accused certain group members of subversion. One host ascribed the cause of group frustration to the facilitator's passive role; and another asked for more flexibility in the leadership to drop unsuccessful plans regardless of the pre-planning effort. Finally, one optimistic host reported that all group objectives were achieved, the group was happy with their end product, which in turn was a positive contribution to the conference.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

Suggested Improvement for the Group Process

As with the previous section, a variety of suggestions for improvement of the group's functioning were listed. These included: more time for group discussion;* less paperwork and structure, simplify the format, and provide fewer activities;* more diversity and lay group (sector) representation;* longer work sessions and no after dinner or night-time meetings;* more time to reflect and not merely to react; modify use of Delphi format by more pre-conference activity, by not defining the group's task prior to the meeting, or by a general statement of Delphi outcomes at the start of the meeting for conference/work group input;* provide better training of group leaders for process, not content, goals; allow for basic agreement on group purposes, goals, tasks, and definitions at the start of the meeting; loosen the conference schedule to provide for more flexibility and different types of activities in each group session;* ensure that group leaders are committed to the conference goals; allow groups to select their own problem areas first, determine outcomes next, and from then on decide on action, activities, and sectors---also, assign one of Delphi problem areas for brainstorming; use group session to bring together different groups (law, global, family, etc.) to develop a coherent composite of citizen education.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

Summary of Facilitators' and Hosts' Views

It would appear that the group leaders believed that the work groups were vital to (one referred to the "guts" of) the conference and that they achieved their own as well as the general conference objectives. Most of the leaders saw the work groups as a place for interaction and individual input into a highly structured and time-consuming conference. They wanted longer sessions, a more open format, less structure, and better trained leaders. The Delphi process was considered well intentioned and useful in terms of results obtained, but misused in the light of overall overstructuring and time constraints. Useful suggestions for overcoming noted deficiences were mentioned, such as using Delphi results as reference points or inputs after the group process had begun on its own list of problem areas in citizen education. Some recommendations, such as the need for more sector representation, are consistent with other deficiencies noted in Section II of this report.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

B. Special Activities Leaders, Resource Persons, and Presenters.

Two separate evaluation forms (see Appendices III and IV) were provided; one for the special activity leaders (also called coordinators and chairpersons) and a second for the resource persons, speakers, and panelists at the special activities or the speakers (also called presenters) at the ten general sessions. In all, there were twenty-eight special activity sessions, with a total of eighty-seven panelists and ten group coordinators listed and thirteen general session speakers. Thus, we have a grand total of some 110 persons involved in these conference activities. However, since some of the speakers, resource persons, and panelists did not attend the conference, we have an actual count closer to 100 persons. Dividing the speakers and others into their respective categories, we find the following figures for seven special activity groups: coordinators, N = 10; speakers and resource persons, N = 87: A. ethics, N = 8; B. global perspectives, N = 10; C. politics, N = 18; D. multi-ethnic, N = 13; E. law related, N = 13; F. economics, N = 19; and G. family-related, N = 6. There were thirteen presenters listed for the ten general sessions.

These forms were distributed by the evaluators and citizen education staff to group leaders for their use and for later distribution to those participating in a leadership capacity. In all, twenty-three or some 22% of the forms were returned, nearly all by return mail. However, half of the special activity leaders returned their forms. Only four of the respondents were anonymous, and about half of those signed and returned were from female leaders. The sectors represented were mostly from education and government, with a few from media or from business and industry and the remainder from nonprofit or voluntary organizations or research groups. The special activity leaders represented in this survey are primarily from law, economics, and political participation. The speakers/panelists/resource persons represented all of the special activity groups, particularly the family-related, law, economic, and political participation groups. These leaders, particularly the coordinators, were present at the conference for three to four days (N = 12), one to two days (N = 6), or for a few hours or half a day (N = 5). In addition to the general sessions and special activities sessions, many of these conference leaders also attended other special activities and general sessions, work groups, and in nearly half the cases, all of the conference activities.

Major Objectives of the Conference.

The principal objective for the conference as seen by this group was to bring civic educators together to list agenda items, including federal policy, for nationwide tasks and through discussion and sharing to resolve any serious conflicts;* to make citizen education a national effort by defining concepts, key issues, and major problems;* to improve citizen education for the masses and for elementary and secondary education; to provide diffusion of citizen education programs, ideas, and strategies, particularly in family education, economics, law, and political participation education.*

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

Professional Effort and Conference Objectives

Most of the respondents merely repeated here the title of their talks e.g., "an historical perspective on citizen education", "citizen participatory action," "global perspectives on citizen education," etc. As seen above, the most prominently mentioned topics related to law, economics, family, and political participation education. Typical of some of the short-term participants in the conference, one respondent reported that he "was not in attendance...long enough to give a qualified answer" to the question.

General Impressions of the Conference

These observers generally found the site to be satisfactory and no criticism on this score was mentioned. The conference staff was described as "hard working," yet the work group facilitators were frequently singled out for their inadequacies in discussion leadership. The Delphi technique was also criticized as having too imprecise, interdependent problems, and being impossible to build on in a single work session. Work sessions, in turn, were variously described as "much too general" and "a farce." Another observer found the participatory level in special activity sessions to be too low. And still another thought the conference "a good forum" for presenting his civic education program and for learning about other new economic programs.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

Mixed reactions to the program were also recorded. One presenter sent a letter to Acting USOE Commissioner William Pierce in which he attacked the use of the Delphi technique as being about as effective as appealing to the Greek oracle for which it was named. Other observers also frequently criticized this technique as they did the "disjointed," "crowded", and "overstructured" program and schedule. Still others questioned the clarity of conference objectives, the overall design, the substance of the conference, and the citizen education awareness of some of the speakers. However, a different group found the conference to be "acceptable," "informative," "pertinent," "interesting," "well organized," "novel," "big and busy," and "very good".

General Problems at the Conference

Many different observations on the conference identified certain critical problems such as: 1. The need for more citizen participation group representation such as Common Cause and the Nader group. 2. More emphasis on what is right, rather than wrong, in citizen education was needed by starting with a discussion of what is right in the field and what can be replicated and made more available. 3. The whole question of the representation of women* needs to be reevaluated. The female speakers were unrepresentative, and only ten percent of the articles in the resource book were written by women. 4. There was criticism of too many presentations by academicians and of the alleged "gap" between practitioners and subject matter specialists. 5. More time for preparation was requested. Everything seemed hurried and late. 6. Smaller meetings, and more of them - with a program built on successful existing citizen education experiences - were requested. 7. The need for a special task force of higher education persons who are responsive to schools and the community was offered as a suggestion. 8. The Delphi forms were attacked* once again with criticism of the time spent on them. Suggested improvements were the editing of results and the presentation of edited results to participants so that the group activity could proceed. Although the Delphi process was "well intentioned," the observer was "skeptical" of the results obtained because of the "forced" nature of the process. 9. Other criticisms concerned poor arrangements for hotel accommodations and conference information, the lack of action by conference planners in response to participant complaints, and the poor quality of the work groups*. 10. The special activity groups were well received as being "solid" and in need of expansion*.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

Summary of Coordinators' and Speakers' Views

This segment of the conference leadership had many responses in common with those of the hosts and facilitators. There seemed to be general agreement on the objectives of the conference, but the relationship between one's professional contribution and these objectives was unclear to respondents except in the most basic and simplistic fashion. Respondents seemed hard-pressed and unable to place their contribution in proper perspective to the conference as a whole. As with other observations noted previously, these speakers and leaders detected difficulties with the tight structure, the malfunctioning work groups, the lack of female speakers, and the misuse of the Delphi technique. These respondents were pleased with the special activities sessions and wanted them expanded to the point where what was effective in the field could be seen, evaluated, and taken home for implementation and application. The speakers/leaders also wanted to improve the sector representation at the conference. Overall, however, this group was satisfied with the conference, but saw that it could be improved.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

IV. THE EVALUATION TEAM'S VIEW OF THE CONFERENCE: Presentations, Work Groups, and Special Activities

This section of the report summarizes the seven member evaluation team's views on the major presentations of the conference as well as the work group and special activities sessions and other facets of the meeting such as registration procedures, coffee breaks and receptions. A participant observer's evaluation form (see Appendix V) was used by the evaluation team to ensure some uniformity in general response format for the open-ended replies.

Registration Procedures, Receptions, and Coffee Breaks

The registration procedures were more notable for their uneventful nature, rather than for any glaring defects. Since so many had preregistered, this lengthy procedure could have been compressed into a shorter period of time perhaps from four hours to a maximum of two. Furthermore, the registration period could have been used to good advantage to: 1. administer the pre-conference internal evaluation form; 2. check on whether the Delphi form had been sent, received, and/or completed by the participant prior to the conference; 3. ask participants who had not received the Delphi survey either to complete it on the spot or prior to the first work group session. This procedure would have assured the Delphi of a sounder footing later in the conference.

There was some evidence of overly officious, formal, and even unfriendly registrars. Those persons selected to organize this important initial activity should be such as to evoke warm, friendly, cooperative, and helpful interaction with participants, rather than an assembly line, routinized, impersonal, large scale, and cash-nexus orientation.

The receptions held on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday evenings were well attended and accomplished their major socializing function. There was an aura of excitement and anticipation present at the first reception, and many had a chance to renew old friendships as well as to make new acquaintances.. This esprit de bon vivant and good fellowship carried over to the second reception, as did the continual socializing. By the third such event, however, fewer were present; and the effects of the intensive meeting schedule had begun to show physically and to be expressed verbally by the conferees. The hors d'oeuvres, however, were plentiful and devoured quickly; and the stiff price for drinks (e.g. soft drink per glass - 75¢) did not inhibit consumption so much as elicit surprise that the conference fee had not covered the affair.

The conference fee also provided nine meals for participants. These formal eating arrangements were variously received by members of the evaluation team. Evaluators cited the formality of these affairs, referring to them as "three banquet sessions per day;"* or the fact that the seating arrangements which collected some ten persons around a table provided them with an opportunity for interchange which might not have been possible otherwise. The food presented on these occasions was up to large hotel and banquet style standards, with the usual criticisms heard.* One of the evaluators, after having been served with popcorn soup on one occasion and strawberry soup on another, became convinced that a child chef was in the hotel kitchen trying out recipes from a kindergarden cookbook! Still another observer was fascinated with the names of halls utilized for a conference on citizen education in a democracy; e.g. The Imperial Ballroom, the Royal Hall, and the Grand Ballroom - somewhat anomalous names, indeed. All meals, particularly dinner, were well attended, with the breakfast sessions being most sparsely populated despite the fact that the formal presentations were each tied to an immediate post-mealtime schedule. Indeed, mealtimes predominated for plenary sessions, save for a few other presentations or general sessions toward the end of the conference.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

Before proceeding to the major presentations, let us also mention something of the coffee/coke breaks, since they also regularly consumed some of the conference time. These activities happened twice a day. No separate charge was made for them, and ample supplies of fattening and non-fattening foods and beverages were present. The hurried pace and different work groups at the conference, however, did not allow very many people either to meet at the same time, or to meet for long. Much of the benefit of such a break was thus lost because of the ever-present spectre of "Father Time" with one hand holding the crowded schedule and, with the other, a stop watch ticking off the precious minutes designated for "relaxation" and relief!

General Session I (Monday Evening) 9/20/76

Major Purposes

The four major purposes of this first meeting were to:

a. welcome participants and open the conference.

b. provide civic legitimacy to the conference through traditional patriotic rituals such as religious invocations, pledge of allegiance, and singing of nationalistic songs.

c. present the crucial problems of citizen education for the next quarter century through two talks by Robert Coles and Frank McClure.

d. set the tone for the conference, provide information on the overall conference schedule and activities, and set the stage for the first work group session later in the evening.

Specific Observations

Dr. Coles was provocative, challenging, and irritating at the same time as he was aimless, wandering, and boring to the evaluators.* Mr. McClure, while perhaps providing some "black legitimacy" for the conference, presented no clear message to the audience, gave us a rhetorical laundry list of problems, and was an even less effective speaker.* The greeting provided by Dr. W. Phillip Hefley for participants seemed to be an afterthought and was rushed, with insufficient time provided for a walk-through of conference activities, techniques, procedures, and goals, and may have contributed to the confusion evident in the subsequent work groups when the unfamiliar Delphi form first appeared.* The traditionalism of the conference format soon became evident when the Boy Scouts (up long past their bed times in some instances) posted the colors, and an all-white choral group from a local high school sang a series of patriotic melodies. Some evaluators found such activities to be overbearing, boring and/or counterproductive* - although one was quite enthusiastic about them.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

General Observations

From the dinner onward the pace of the conference was set - hurried, crowded, full, and yet incomplete. The opening session provided the classic contrast..."between rah, rah middle Americanism with flag waving, versus an attack on traditional citizen education attitudes - it showed how far we have to go! Yet these contrasts were helpful, if disturbing". The opening session was too long and allowed the already tight schedule to slip.

Suggested Improvements

The following suggestions were offered for improvement of the opening sessions:

a. cut the registration time - start all three initiatory activities earlier and finish them earlier.

b. omit the invocations and patriotic rituals - one keynote talk is enough.*

c. have only two speakers - a kick-off speaker (e.g., Secretary Mathews) and a "nuts and bolts", organization speaker,

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

(e.g., Commissioner Hefley).*

d. omit a formal, banquet type dinner* or use cafeteria or buffet style instead.

General Session II (Monday Morning) 9/21/76

Major Purposes

The primary purposes of this presentation were to:

a. review the history of citizen education in line with the conference objectives.

b. show that civic education has been an issue of major concern in the U.S. for 200 years.

c. allow work groups to reflect on current themes and efforts in citizen education in contrast/concert with the past.

Specific Observations

This presentation by Professor R. Freeman Butts suffered from its early morning schedule, since history and one's morning coffee make an unusual mixture. The poor lighting, the early morning chill, and the weighty topic distracted from this scholarly presentation. The chronological presentation did not allow for presentation of citizen education activities and functions and the stress was on the formal substance, rather than the major themes, of citizen education.

This speech was well received by the evaluators, who believed it to be an "excellent contribution," "well organized and clear," a "succinct, articulate and sound" talk which was "interesting, informative and relevant."* Most of the audience, despite the early morning hour, was quite attentive; and the speech referred to the major problem areas in the U.S. thoughout. It was "right on the money." Dr. Butts was an able, personable, and effective speaker who knew his topic and had much to say for other citizen education efforts, as contrasted with the young Mr. McClure, "who should have stayed in Texas," according to one observer.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

General Observations

The focus of this talk may have been too narrow, in that the historical view could have been made more socio-political and broadened to include citizen education processes and activities, the family, work place, community, state, etc. However, since two-thirds of the listeners were from the education/governmental sectors, the talk probably suited audience interests. The attendance level was good for such an early morning session.

Suggested Improvements

"Light up the hall and the speaker and heat up the place - change the time to 9:00 a.m. to improve attendance and attention level!"* Provide for question and answer periods for this and all other presentations.* Since this was a historical paper, it could have been reproduced and distributed prior to the conference;* and the speaker could have summarized it and talked of other things, such as the relationship between the historical view and this conference.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

It would be helpful to offer a few lines of introduction for each speaker, despite the printed thumbnail sketches. And one evaluator contributed this observation: "provide patriotic, wake-up music!"

General Session III (Tuesday Morning) 9/21/76

Major Purposes

The purposes of this meeting were to:

a. relate the crucial problem areas previously discussed in the other activities to the major sector areas in citizen education (home, mass media, education, etc.).

b. provide a contrasting liberal/conservative view for use in work group discussions.

c. provoke a dialogue between representatives of different philosophical interest groups and thus challenge some conference objectives.

Specific Observations

The "dynamism" and "concern" of both Dr. Michael Scriven and Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., were evident to one evaluator. Another said that Dr. Scriven related to the problem and sector areas whereas Mr. Buckley did not. Adjectives applying to each respectively were: Scriven, "right on target," "surpassed expectations," "interesting, informative and challenging," and Buckley, "too casual toward topic," "an incomplete and cheap shot presentation;" and for both speakers, "elicited strong participant reactions," "more two separate lectures, not an exchange" and "an interesting contrast between the conservative/

individual freedom and wrong is not to be tolerated viewpoint as versus the liberal educational innovator's viewpoint of citizenship, ethics, and morality." One evaluator added that the hotel staff members who arrived with the water pitcher, glasses, and the American flag in the middle of the presentation provided "a nice Kansas City touch!". The "powerful personalities" of both speakers could not fail to impress.

Buckley ignored the topic, except for a few links between the right/ethical/free/religious issues. Scriven reduced the problem to elements of decline in ethics/morality, new media usage, withering away of the family, new types of crime, and educational deterioration, which he linked with waning national autonomy, population growth, government incompetence, and a new ethnicity and ethics. Buckley's cost-benefit was poor when compared with Scriven. Scriven's attack on the CCSO's model of citizenship (rationality and action) was significant. He proposed understanding and teaching about things - not forcing action - while maintaining that understanding precedes action. He said that the cognitive approach precedes affective and behavorial changes and is the only legitimate way for citizen education. Not only are the CCSO objectives too traditional, according to Scriven, but he maintained that the most dangerous element to citizen education today is local control of the schools.

General Observations

The worth of this session, according to one participant-observer, was judged by the work group's abundant use of the presentation in the subsequent session. The two talks provided a useful contrast between the individual choice and group socialization goals of citizen education. Scriven's emphasis on individual development and diversity was a highlight of the conference and should have been reinforced. Buckley should have stayed and accepted his challenge and that of the participants instead of running off to catch a plane. "This was not $3,000 worth of Mr. Buckley - at least 'Dear Abby' had the guts to stick it out later - as bad as McClure!" Buckley was strongest in his link between government/business, labor and liberty saying the primary secular value was human freedom. Scriven said the citizen education curriculum was obsolete and proposed the study of growth, economics, global perspectives, crime, family, media, communications, law, ethics and religion, and the principles of, and alternative to, American government. But since Scriven was so future oriented, he should have appeared later in the conference.

One evaluator noted that the presiding official cited the fact that this was "Constitution Week" and that it was also "significant that the flag was posted in the middle of the debate - late, but ever present!"

Suggested Improvements

Provide more time for audience interaction with presenters and for speakers to interact with one another*. Ensure that all speakers have properly planned their time schedule and are committed to the conference and their role - there was no excuse for Buckley running off.* More time should be allowed for such controversial speakers -

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

allow them to sit in small groups with working members. Since one speaker seemed to have "ripped off" the conference, he could have just as well been taped and presented to participants differently. Provide for all preparations (including setting up for the coffee break, heating, lighting, water, and flags) before the speakers start.* Also,the room itself was not esthetically pleasing and the acoustics were very poor.

General Session IV (Tuesday Afternoon) 9/21/76

Major Purposes

The primary purposes of this presentation were to:

a. point out the current problems and deficiences of citizen education.
b. relate citizen education to the schools and the mass media, particularly television.
c. suggest means for improving citizen education.

Specific Observations

Since Dr. B. Frank Brown was ill and not present, a substitute speaker presented this talk without comment or interaction in a rhetorical vein. The content of the paper was significant and well documented. The statistics on television usage and the fact that we have no national civic education program for television were both well made points. The paper also made some interesting, if well-known, points about lack of discipline and crime in the schools and flailed away at the physical education teacher who supposedly is still teaching civics, also asking that citizen education be taken away from him and the social studies teacher. More emphasis on school self governance by students also evoked some discussion, as it always does, if nothing more. Frank Brown's laundry list of other problem areas (powerlessness and alienation, racism, sexism, imperialism, institutional disrespect, inflation, energy crisis, anti-traditionalism, student unrest, and of course the CIA, Watergate, the bureaucracy, and the multi-nationals) provided the participants with reminders of our collective sins. The indictment of the schools for providing distributive, driver and drug education rather than moral and civic education leads one to wonder if the surrogate speaker or Dr. Brown really understood the difference between civics or citizenship education on the one hand and political or citizen education on the other.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

General Observations

This talk illustrated the need for more balance between problems and deficiencies on the one side and strengths of citizen education on the other. The link provided between alienation, non-participation, and deficiencies in citizen education was a useful contribution. The need to identify a core curriculum for citizen education and a new definition of citizen education became apparent. This indictment of the civics teachers for deficiencies in their training or certification is less well grounded in research than is their unwillingness to teach morality. Lack of formal training may be less important than willingness to risk an open discussion of moral issues in the classroom toward the development of democratic values.

Suggested Improvements

Duplicate and distribute the talk if a speaker does not show up; or else provide a useful substitute speaker or other constructive use of the time, such as giving more time to the work groups or more free time to the participants. Tape Frank Brown, sick or not, and have all the conference papers reproduced before the meeting!

General Session V (Tuesday Evening) 9/21/76

Major Purposes

The objectives of this presentation were to:

a. present views on the U.S. as a national community with global perspectives.

b. allow Secretary Mathews to give his perspectives on the conference as a whole and to lend his authority to achievement of conference objectives.

c. as threatening problems arise, allow time for the conference coordinator to present them for discussion during plenary session so that immediate corrective action can be taken with the consensus of participants.

Specific Observations

The HEW Secretary showed his interest in developing a new concept of citizen education. He was "good medicine" for those who think all high ranking governmental officials are a sham. The Secretary defined his concept of citizen education (i.e., certain knowledge objectives and beliefs leading to individual participation and governmental action) and redefined HEW tasks as a subset of total governmental redefinition of public tasks, officials, and agencies. Most interesting were the general statistics on the enormity of the HEW enterprise: 350 programs and 140,000 personnel, spending 140 billion dollars annually, or over one-fourth of the total federal budget. The Secretary's stress on the fact that civics is taught as a "spectator sport", and the need for increased citizen participation, came home to the audience.

General Observations

Our evaluators thought the Secretary's talk to be helpful, although evening sessions at the end of a busy day are not occasions for deep thought. The one criticism mentioned was that he did not address his assigned topic, "A National Community with Global Perspectives". Rather, he chose to describe HEW's role in fostering citizen participation through citizen education. The presiding official also antagonized some of the "female caucus" members, who did not appreciate his off-handed (condescending?) characterization of one female participant on the platform as a "pretty" representative of her sex in lieu of her given name, which he had forgotten. This, in addition to his lengthy introduction, "turned off" some of the evaluators and the audience and proved counterproductive. Since the participants were either tired or tiring fast, they did not make the best audience; indeed they had accepted their inactive passive/recipient role as an audience at these banquets. Dr. Hefley's observations and promises were thought to be, respectively, innocuous and written on the wind.

Suggested Improvements

Much agreement centered on having Secretary Mathews appear earlier in the conference. As one observer said, "Bring in the biggies on the first day!" or as another said, "This was a kick off, not a mid-point talk!" A third observed,"His charisma would have been more transferrable on the first day!". As for the conference coordinator's role, he or she ought to perform a periodic accounting rather than a mea culpa role, based on participant feedback with carry through/implementation of suggestions as soon as possible. The presiding official's role ought to be better defined, to emphasize short introductions, humorous, pointed, or poignant observations; and a low-key approach.

General Session VI (Wednesday Morning) 9/22/76

Major Purposes

The objectives of this talk were to:

a. discuss "alternatives" in citizen education.
b. challenge some basic assumptions of the conference, raise intellectual vision, and improve constructive interrelationships and understandings.
c. project the image of the speaker as an "outsider" or "alternative citizen" and a spokesman for those not present or even invited to the conference.
d. ask basic identity questions such as "Who am I?" and "Are we the people?".

Specific Observations

The speaker, Professor Badi Foster, used his personal observations, rather than a citizen education curriculum or formal program, as a guide for questioning the conference questions. He presented process and substantive questions about the subject, such as "Who, what, when, and where are we?" The talk was very well received.* Like Dr. Mathews' talk, it was also low keyed and non-threatening, if subtly challenging. Other remarks follow: "superb speech - excellently delivered, powerful, "right on target for a definition of citizen education which was established, defined, and implemented" in the talk; "the common problems of life for all were discussed - e.g., awareness and compassion as well as the relevance of guiding questions, not final answers," "an excellent presentation of the polarities of citizen education goals - integrative versus divisive, trust versus alienation, distance versus closeness, involvement versus spectatorship, and participation versus alienation."

General Observations

This was an appropriate mid-point challenge. The talk was succinct, direct, and understandable. The audience was attentive and interested in the vital questions raised, such as who had been invited, who came and why, who did not come, and whom do we represent? One observer thought this the most substantive, well-developed, and best presented talk to this point in the conference, whereas others said the talk may have lacked substance and raised more questions than answers.

Suggested Improvements

No criticism was raised of the "breakfast-talk" scheduling or other such matters. Instead, there were other comments indicating that it could not have been improved, and that this was one of the most effective presentations yet heard. On two points only - the need for exchange between the speaker and participants and the request for one tentative answer to at least one question about citizen education - were suggestions made for improvement.

General Session VII (Wednesday Afternoon) 9/22/76

Major Purposes

This talk aimed to:

a. discuss how citizen education can be improved for youth.

b. relate the topic of citizen education improvement to the conference as a whole.

Specific Observations

An excellent, clear, and organized presentation by Dr. Howard Mehlinger on all major sectors: school, family, media, etc., was well-received by an attentive audience. His point that citizen education is not problem solving, any more than driver education is a problem to be solved, was well received. The call for education in "reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic, and responsibility" although not new, was also appreciated , as was his case for fostering a strategy for grass roots reform of citizen education through formation of a national professional association of citizen educators.

General Observations

This talk presented an excellent summary of the educational impact of television on citizen education for all levels. It is surprising that it was so well received, since "the audience looked beat".

Suggested Improvements

No substantive suggestions for improvement were made, except the usual ones to the effect that formal talks should be duplicated and distributed, the speaker should say something different than what is written, and that more speaker/audience interaction was needed.

General Session VIII (Wednesday Evening) 9/22/76

Major Purposes

The major objectives of this speech were to:

a. relate citizen education to larger societal purposes

b. "induce inspiration," according to one observer.

Specific Observations

The speech by The Reverend James Jackson was very well received. In the words of one evaluator, it was a "tremendously inspiring call to arms in the fight againt stifling mediocrity and decadence." Jackson's plug for his own PUSH program did not interfere with his topic since the two were interrelated. His indictment of the perversity of some "pop" songs purveyed by disc jockeys hit home to everyone concerned about children.

General Observations

The quotation, "I loved it," from one of our observers, sums up the audience reaction. This oration, in the finest sense of the word, stressed self-sacrifice, personal discipline, and self-determination to achieve - all "old fashioned" American values which were not being emphasized in our formal or informal education system.

Suggested Improvements

No other suggestions were offered, other than that this could well have been the first presentation.

General Sessions IX and X (Thursday Morning) 9/23/76

Major Purposes

The objectives of these presentations were to:

a. present a viewpoint on how citizen education could help resolve some of the crucial problem areas.

b. summarize some findings relevant to citizen education from the national assessment findings and the conference Delphi results.

c. summarize work group findings, citizen education problems, objectives and next steps, and

d. discuss a national policy for citizen education in the U.S.

Specific Observations

The talks by Ms. Abigail Van Buren ("Dear Abby") was largely dismissed as being either irrelevant or in poor taste for a conference such sa this. She was also labelled as being unrepresentative of professional women involved in citizen education. However, her points regarding the poorer basic writing skills of her correspondents was of some significance. The national assessment findings by Dick Hulsart, although excellent, came too late to be of use for a conference input. There was not even an attempt at a final conference summary which, at this point, might have come off badly. Only the talks by Mr. Richard Hulsart and Mr. Logan Sallada (on national policy objectives) received above average grades, as did that by Dr. Terrel Bell (attendance was about 50 persons) on morality and ethics and citizen education. The Delphi results were interesting and may be useful for other conferences. Marginal notes by participants regarding the "constructive frustration" of the work groups and the enforcement versus leadership roles of the USOE also bear mention.

General Observations

Mr. Sallada's discussion of consensus versus risk goals in citizen education, and his putting together the pieces of the conference puzzle (in terms of Office of Education interests, use of the Delphi process, etc.) helped to provide some much needed unity for the conference. This presentation was labelled "excellent, succinct, clear, poignant, and substantive". The provision made for the reactions of general participants and staff members was one of the few opportunities for interaction between those on the podium and those in the audience. Participants finally were given an opportunity to talk about the conference to the fast-dwindling (about 110 persons) group. Representatives from different projects and activity groups also had an opportunity to deliver a "commercial" about their work as it related to the conference objectives.

Suggested Improvements

As with all the well-received talks, it was suggested that Mr. Sallada's speech would be better scheduled at the start of the conference. The visibility in the meeting hall, the acoustics, and the lighting were unsatisfactory; more time should have been allowed for the speakers; and Ms. Van Buren should have been replaced with someone more relevant to the conference concerns. Time for a more complete summary of conference outcomes and a pre-conference abstract of the national assessment results were also suggested for the format of future conference. Provision for participants to deliver their "commercials" should have been allowed earlier in the meetings. The discussion of Delphi process/results could also have been shifted to an earlier time in the meeting.

Summary of Presentations

The conference presentations and presiding officials seemed to be separated into the "bad guys" and the "good guys". The "good guys" had something substantial to contribute in the way of needed or significant information, emotional appeal, or bringing order out of chaos. The "bad guys" refused to relate to the substance of the conference or the underlying process, while "doing their own thing"and putting on their standard act. The same criticisms applied to those who chaired the various sessions. Since this is not the place to list those who did or did not "make it", we leave it to perceptive readers to decide for themselves just which of the presenters belongs on which list.

The Work Groups (Monday Evening-Wednesday Evening) 9/20/76-9/22/76

Twenty work groups met for five separate sessions of 60 to 90 minutes duration. This summary has sampled five of these twenty work groups as being representative of the whole. The members of the evaluation team used Form #2, Participant Observer's Evaluation of Citizen Education Meeting (see Appendix V) to evaluate the group sessions in a uniform fashion.

Major Objectives

The principal purposes of these work sessions as seen by the participant observers were to:

a. develop a common definition of citizen education.

b. provide a foundation and the principles for a citizen education curriculum.

c. achieve the conference objectives, including the aims of the Delphi process.*

d. serve as facilitator and channel for information from states and localities.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

e. recommend problem areas for study and suggest appropriate sectors of response for citizen education study and techniques.

f. help participants realize the magnitude and many dimensions of citizen education.

g. help group members understand the goals of citizen education and the conference itself.

Strengths

The observers saw the following items as strong points of the groups:

a. the group was diverse in sector representation and temperament.

b. the facilitator encouraged free exchange of opinions.

c. group consensus was soon arrived at regarding method of proceeding as well as the fundamental principales and questions for citizen education.

d. the group helped participants to sense the importance for all sectors of society of overcoming semantic and other basic problems of citizen education.

e. the leaders helped members to recognize problems and alternatives and to work on substantive issues.

f. the group process coincided well with conference objectives.

Weaknesses

The evaluation team saw the following as weaker features of the groups:

a. the formal structure imposed by the Delphi process met with immediate group resistance which hindered group processes.

b. the conference planners made no provision for variations in group approaches.

c. much time was wasted on the painful process of abandoning the misunderstood Delphi technique.

d. the group did not accomplish its objectives since there was not enough time to do so.

e. late evening is the wrong time to begin a group session or to have a group meeting during the conference.

f. not enough time was allowed for exchange of information or for discussion of major presentations.*

Specific and General Observations

The evaluators also had several general comments to make:

a. the group ignored the Delphi format and problem solving format early, in order to achieve its aims/goals.

b. the group did not prepare its own list of citizen education problems, issues, and responsibilities.

c. effective and insightful leadership displayed by the group leaders was responsible for group successes.

d. the group stressed development of individual citizens by arming them with information and analytical skills for making informal decisions in their roles as citizens.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

e. only the personal empathy and compassion of leaders maintained group momentum throughout the conference.

f. this was 'one of the most aimless, unstructured, rudderless, and ineffective groups I have ever attended; it was sheer chaos and a waste of time."

g. several of the facilitators wore flags, MCP ties and the like which were quite appropriate for a conference in Kansas City, according to more than one team member.

Suggestions for Improvement

Several suggestions for improvement were also offered, to include the following:

a. if the Delphi technique is used again, ask groups to respond to/define/discuss the list of problems first; then consider participants' prior rankings of those problems and issues; finally, reach agreement on a new revised list with rankings.

b. a clear explanation of the entire conference process, including the purposes of work groups, is needed at the start of the meeting.*

c. provide conference participants with several options or styles for group problem solving.

d. ensure that all participants have input into the Delphi findings, if used in a group setting again.*

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

e. during the first plenary session, discuss the role of the work groups within the overall conference plan.

f. select participants for work groups on the basis of qualifications, interests, motivation to achieve, etc. (Just how to do this was not specified!)

g. better training of group leaders is needed, since they must combat tough time schedules, apathy, and misconceptions of the conference as a whole.

Summary of Work Group Observations

As one observer said, "I learned something in spite of the problems. I enjoyed the experience and, with modifications, stand ready to try it again." This was a typical response indicating mixed reactions to the work group experience. Much of the success of the meeting depended on the leaders and the quality and mix of participants in the group. Since the work groups took up approximately one full day, or one-third of the conference schedule, it is imperative that they be well staffed and led. Better selection and training of facilitators/hosts should be a prime concern of future conferences, as should be the provision of clear objectives for each group with a flexible format and schedule to fit group interests and needs. More early movement from group to group might be allowed, as well as improved matching of participants, perhaps by sectors.

The Special Activity Groups (Tuesday-Wednesday) 9/21/76-9/22/76

There were four concurrent sessions, each about 90 minutes long for seven special activities. Five different special-activity sessions were monitored on several occasions (political participation, ethics, economics, multi-ethnic, and law related) by the conference evaluators. (Actually, all seven special activities were monitored for all sessions by the evaluation team, but written records were kept on five of the seven). These observers also used Form #2, Participation Observer's Evaluation of Citizen Education Meeting (see Appendix V), to evaluate these sessions in a standardized manner.

Major Objectives

There were several objectives for these activities; among them were to:

a. relate two subtopics (political theory and political parties/partisanship) of political science as a discipline to the conference themes.

b. provide overviews of the various subfields of citizen education (such as political participation, multi-ethnic, morality and ethics, and economics) to interested participants.*

c. introduce or reinforce the use of role playing and other teaching techniques in the "new" social studies.

d. discuss research findings, such as Kohlberg's moral stages, and apply them to educational practice.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

e. describe successful experimental programs underway in certain parts of the country.*

f. present information on value clarification and cognitive decisions.

g. focus on creating a new civics through new goals, processes, and expectations for political education.

h. relate research on television as an educational and communications medium to the reform of citizen education.

i. inform participants of the role of religious groups in ethics education.

Strengths of the Activity Sessions

Several strong points were also described for these sessions such as:

a. much participant involvement in the activity.

b. inspiring leaders, very practical, and very professional program.

c. fine interrelationship between qualified leaders/speakers and their audience-leaders; "competence," "power," "feeling," and "personal qualities" evident.*

d. a real understanding of the materials and programs presented from an insider's point of view.

e. presentation of much useful and interesting material in a short time.

f. discussion of the school as a political unit.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

g. use of novel ideas and technology for presentations; e.g., videotape "samplers."

Weaknesses of the Special Activities

While there were strengths in the special activities program, there were also weaknesses, among them being:

a. too much stress on the disciplinary elements of citizen education, using a boring lecture mode.

b. not enough time - only weakness was that participants had to stop.*

c. "no weaknesses apparent."*

d. projects presented were too provincial and local - could not be initiated, adopted, or adapted to use elesewhere with a knowledge that they would work.

e. poor grouping of two nationwide elementary and secondary projects with a very localized project in a "show and tell" session.

f. participants were tired this late in the conference and the speakers were not dynamic.

Roles of the Leaders, Panelists, and Speakers

Observers were also asked to comment on the roles played by the leadership of the activity group, which they did as follows:

a. leader used active/passive mode and was acceptable -

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

provided some useful input into the session.*

b. responsible for actively directing the program, ensuring that the time was used effectively* - good introduction and summary of session.*

c. ensured time for questions, answers, and audience participation.

Suggested Improvements

Several comments were made regarding improvements in the activities such as:

a. the citizenship-participation and rational-choice objectives of citizen education in the political system need more discussion elsewhere.

b. allow more time.*

c. provide round tables or different seating arrangement for group involvement.

d. avoid straight lectures which do not use handouts and other teaching aids.

e. regulate/limit group size to a reasonable number - say 35-40 persons.

f. give handouts describing the project name, address, materials available, publisher, etc.*

g. eliminate the two sessions on political science as a discipline and, also, local "show and tell" groups which were too provincial! Allow people to sign up for special activities on a free choice basis.

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

h. improve timing, speakers, and lecture methods.*

Other Comments/Personal Observations

This category of responses allowed participant observers free rein to make the following comments:

a. this activity (on television and education) should be presented to the entire country!

b. the first two very disparate and boring sessions - on education and politics --- could have been eliminated.

c. the ethnic group refers to 60 million ethnics; they are farcical in some ways, but know where they are going; they want to help society, but on their terms.

d. useful models for citizen education and ethnicity are the New York state, Cleveland/Detroit/St. Louis, and India materials for ethnics and non-ethnic students and adults.

e. the smaller political participation projects involving a few people belong at the regional, state, or local conferences - a network of these activities should be set up.

f. some of the model materials and programs left gaps, e.g., the "slow learner;" but that is to be expected.

g. why not one or two model programs for each new curriculum area on the conference program?

---

*Indicates frequently mentioned response.

Summary of Special Activity Sessions

Some of our observers were quite impressed with all of these activities, saying that they were "excellent and informative" or "were of profound educational value to me as a person". The key combination of elements for an effective program are:

1. effective leaders/chairpersons.
2. interesting and novel ideas, information, materials and programs.
3. involvement of participants in the learning activity.
4. school or educationally based materials which have been tried out on many groups and age levels.
5. some chance of follow up or additional contact with the project directors and their materials, either directly or through a publisher/distributor.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Throughout this report we have provided the reader with section-by-section and part-by-part summaries of the principal conclusions from each major division of the study. Our purpose here is merely to draw from those summary statements the major elements of our conclusions and recommendations for the planning, organization, implementation and follow-up activities for future USOE efforts in the citizen education field.

A. Principal Conclusions

The following list of items represents our primary general and specific conclusions from this research activity:

1. The Kansas City conference was a qualified success in achieving some of its objectives.

2. The average conference participant was satisfied with the conference as a whole, because it produced personal benefits. However, certain features of the conference were grossly defective (e.g., inadequate statement of conference objectives, imperfect application of the Delphi technique, insufficient treatment of state and local government concerns, inequitable sector representation, no evolution of a "game plan" for citizen education, overstructuring of the conference, lack of definition of the intended scope of the conference and of its design for the accomplishment of conference objectives).

3. Significant minorities at the conference believed that deficiencies they noted in the conference format could have been corrected on the spot and were not. They also perceived serious inadequcies in pre-conference information, invitations, the coffee breaks, the conference communications system, printed resource materials, and the balance between theory and application.

4. Large numbers of those present at the conference wanted some time for socializing and relaxation, as well as for work groups, special activities, and both formal and informal interction with major speakers and conference leaders.

5. A substantial number of participants wanted improvements in the work group process and in the selection of the facilitators with whom they were obliged to work so closely.

6. Significant numbers of participants were dissatisfied with certain of the major presentations (discussed previously in great detail), as well as with certain portions of the special-activity sessions. These features of the conference warrant a more careful review.

7. The conference objectives planned by the leadership were perceived differently by participants in terms of substantive content, emphasis, procedures and processes. There is need for hard work on this critical aspect of conference management.

8. On balance, the conference partially achieved its objectives of sector representation (with two sectors, education and government, overrepresented); identification of key issues in public and civic

education; and review and listing of problems and deficiencies in citizen education. But it did not produce a significant list of recommendations for action or of useful findings for subsequent conferences (unless a rigorous reworking of the Delphi results, the work group reports, and these evaluation data are included as output measures!).

9. The external conference evaluation produced an alternative list of objectives as perceived by the participants, which may be even more useful for future conference planning than the pre-conference objectives described in this report.

10. The principal features of the conference which proved troublesome are fully discussed above, but are here reiterated for review pruposes: overrigorous structure of program and work groups; too long and full working hours; lack of free time for recreation and "visiting"; inadequate and unsystematic attention to critical problem areas with too much process and paperwork, and no substance, e.g., the Delphi; defects in the recruitment and invitation process which produced insufficient sector representation as well as inadequacies in the numbers of professional women, minorities, and special interests; too formalized presentations with some inaccessible, unrepresentative, and irrelevant speakers who frequently ignored their topics; inadequacies in some facilitators' handling of their groups; and, finally, communication deficiencies which occurred before and during the conference regarding poor information exchange, unclear objectives, and little attention to cross-communications and information retrieval and sharing.

11. The lack of a clearly and widely known focus and strategy for Kansas City had a domino effect on other features of the conference in that support personnel (e.g., presenters and resource persons) did not know how their efforts would fit into the overall scheme of things.

12. There was considerable evidence of resentment toward, and mistrust of, "government" and federal bureaucrats. Many participants linked the overstructuring and use of forms at the conference with the excessive influence of the Washington and Kansas City USOE staffs.*

13. Participants' comments indicated that there was obvious distrust of the conference sponsors; and many believed that they were there merely to ratify,in rubber-stamp fashion, pre-determined, hidden agenda.

14. Throughout the conference there were "bad vibrations" and feelings of emotional hostility with the participants developing a sense of a "we," (the "innocent," "well meaning," "open," "democratic," "friendly," "practical," "willing," "manipulated," etc. participants) versus "they" (the "devious," "authoritarian," "bureaucratic," "manipulative," "closed," "routinized," "unlistening," "hostile," etc. staff of conference planners and organizers).*

---

*All items marked with an asterisk are based on a post-conference meeting between the evaluators and the Citizen Education Staff in Washington, D. C. A summary of these observations is available from the evaluators or from their Citizen Education Staff, USOE, Washington, D. C.

15. The Delphi process became the focus for participant resentment, distrust, and anger discussed in items 12, 13, and 14 above, which hostility in turn was reinforced through repeated reintroduction of the Delphi results and forms through two-thirds of the conference. Explosive relief or overreaction within work groups by "chucking the Delphi," and "doing one's own thing" was one device frequently used to relieve frustrations.*

16. The emotional distance between "us" and "them" spilled over to other facets of the conference creating a sort of domino effect.

17. Participants also opted or dropped out of special activity sessions, not because of their limited worth, but because of the expressed need for some time to oneself to "satisfy one's personal needs."*

18. Both the selection of participants and their mix in work and activity groups produced a counterproductive ambience in these groups, since many were poorly motivated, hostile, dominant and/or anti-establishment.*

19. The facilitators themselves (in part because of defects in the selection and training processes) were hard pressed to handle the difficulties they faced with the program: the diversity of their groups, frustration with the Delphi, counterproductive role conflicts, such as being identified as an "ivory tower" educator dominating the interaction of a group which included "practical" businessmen, or being tagged as a representative of the conference "establishment" (and therefore suspect).

20. Conference leaders also succumbed to the "armed camp" phenonmenon when they had to defend their bastions against the attacks of the "barbarians" (participants) who did not seem to understand what was "best" (i.e. planned) for them or what was at stake here for conference managers in terms of "loss of face" if the predetermined plans were aborted.

21. Certain basic features of the conference lent credence to certain participants' charges of WASP dominance and of not-so-subtle sexism, racism, class and sector biases,and other destructive divisiveness. A half dozen groups broke away from any identification with the larger citizen education/conference community for the sake of long-standing private concerns and interests which were presumably more important - no lowest common denominator for the conference was ever reached. Compromise of differences, "the lowest of the goods and the highest of the evils," was never approached until the last day.*

22. The "armed camp" phenomenon also spilled over into rivalries between the Washington and Kansas City USOE staffs with, for example, mutual distrust of each faction's leaders, staff personnel, evaluation teams and even into different perceptions of the definition, objectives, and desired outcomes of the conference and of citizen education itself. For example, the conflict between the innovative citizen/civic/participant or political education system, broadly conceived and defined for the one hand (the D. C. view) versus the more formal and traditional citizenship, civics, or passive governmental education system narrowly defined

(the Kansas City view) was never really faced. It remained unresolved at the conference and gradually divided the conference into three groups - the committed, the unknowing, and the "enemy." The conference produced no unity, encouraged diversity, and fell short of unity in diversity, compromise, or a common denominator for citizen/citizenship education.*

23. The conference evaluation process, itself, was entangled into the "armed camp" mentality i.e. an internal versus an external evaluation team. Different groups of major or minor feudal educational lords and vassals were allied with one camp or the other, until it was finally decided that a holy truce would be called for the last half of the conference. The external evaluation process, itself, suffered from this divisiveness as well as from its own inherent deficiencies of lengthy, cumbersome form, time for completion, and other factors such as typographical errors and inaccuracies - most of them stemming from time pressures and erroneous advance information on which certain segments of the forms were based. The evaluators also should have had time for the schedule to explain the process, and time specifically set aside for participants to complete the pre-tested forms.*

24. The conference as a whole may be considered a success in that it approached the totality of citizen education (with all its concerns and risks in the open) and helped to raise the public consciousness level regarding the field. It was a useful "first try," providing valuable experience for planning future regional, state, and other national conferences.*

25. Participants valued this conference for several reasons. They were impressed with some of the speakers and what they had to say. They welcomed this opportunity for the dialogue, contact and exchange of information and ideas with their peers and their "betters." The special-activities sessions were a definite asset; and certain of the work groups were quite productive and satisfying to participants. The highest priority, however, was the topic of the conference; indeed the topic was by far the most important attraction to the attendees. Certain conferees were also impressed with the different areal and sector representatives with whom they worked and talked. Their horizons were mutually broadened, or so it appears. And some of those present - a definite minority - even complimented the strict, tight, and rigorous pace of the meeting which, apparently, came close to being all things to all people!*

26. With all of this said, our overall evaluation of the conference is that it was a success, albeit a qualified success. Conference participants, leaders, planners, and evaluators were impressed with the enormity of the undertaking, as well as with the importance of its tasks and the sweep of its objectives. When one aims for the heavens and lands somewhere in between, the trip cannot be called a failure - except for under-achievement of one's own expectations. This was the first such national conference on citizen education ever held in the United States and that, itself, is a major accomplishment recognized by participants.

Success of the conference will be measured hereafter by what happens to citizen education across the United States, inasmuch as this conference was only one phase of a larger plan or policy for this vital aspect of our formal and informal educational system.

B. Principal Recommendations

Many of the significant recommendations regarding the citizen education project in general and the Kansas City conference (and subsequent conferences) in particular have been mentioned in passing above. Here we shall present something of a laundry list of proposed "solutions" to the deficiencies noted previously--which itself a risky task indeed! Our suggestions for improving conference operations include the following items:

1. Improve the pre-conference planning process by stating clearly achievable objectives that are directly related to the conference inputs, throughputs and outputs. For example, if participants are to use a lengthy resource book or other reading material during the conference, then they should receive this material and "reading assignment" prior to the conference. By the same token, an exposition of conference objectives and of conference design should be sent to all invitees prior to the conference.

2. Schedule the conference agenda to allow for greater flexibility in accommodating participants' and leaders' suggestions and revisions during and after the conference. Be ready to discard or revise conference segments and plans as necessary to

ensure achievement of objectives, regardless of the amount of pre-planning time put into them. Provide time for periodic interaction and feedback between conference leaders and participants, to allow suggestions to be elicited, discussed, implemented, and evaluated as an on-going conference process.

3. Allow enough free time for participants and for participant interaction - both formally, through question-and-answer-periods, and informally, through such devices as an evening "open house" or "free university" schedule for those interested in common topics.

4. Schedule fewer formal banquet presentations and "name" speakers; and be sure that each speaker not only addresses the topic, but also prepares a formal paper for pre-conference distribution, summarizes the paper, says something else of significance, and interacts with the audience.

5. Papers and "books" need not be commissioned for the conference, when a few short hand-outs and in-house papers would do. Recent speeches, papers, and other materials on citizen education by Secretary Mathews, former Commissioner Bell, Mr. Sallada and Mr. Lowe did not appear in the conference book of readings, nor were they distributed prior to or during the conference - although they might well have been.

6. Make definite plans for proper sector representation by inviting and paying for the expenses of, or for papers from, representatives from different sectors of American society.

7. Improve the work - group and special-activity processes by better training of leaders, clearer definition of their objectives and roles, and experimenting with different methods of grouping persons, e.g., by sectors, sub-specialties, geographic areas, etc.. As for special activities, cut the number in half; present those which have regional, state, or local interest to **selected persons** and provide for more systematic dissemination to all participants of basic information on what is happening in each of the special-activity fields.

8. Provide for better communications from one work group to another and from one special activity to another. Allow for free movement from group to group and for wider dissemination of what has happened and what is planned in the different groups, either orally or in print.

9. Explain the conference goals, objectives, precedures, expectations, and "game plan" at the start of the meeting. If the Delphi process is used, sharply modify its use by building it into the early description/discussion of expectations and by changing its name to "consensus survey."*

10. Drastically revise the group process by: splitting each sector into smaller groups or by constituting a cross section of representatives; adjusting the meal schedule to allow work groups to eat together; encouraging group identity and cohesion; asking groups to identify key questions or problem areas for their sector; and either allowing each group considerable latitude in its approach to attaining group objectives or providing more guidance with built-in flexibility. Participants should be encouraged to attend all events, particularly the special activity sessions.

11. Better selectivity of participants and facilitators would improve the conference. Both should be aware of what they are getting into and should be given an opportunity to "opt out." The use of federal government staff as leaders ought to be reevaluated. Improved sector, racial, ethnic, sex, economic class, youth, and other representation is a must for any future conferences discussing citizen education for the citizenry. The facilitators/leaders should also be better selected and trained. Participants should be ready to discuss the objectives proposed for their groups, and to reach consensus on the most productive and balanced route to follow in reaching them. This information should also be shared from group to group.

Facilitators should be qualified and motivated, and should "buy into" the conference. There should be "dry run" training sessions for group leaders during which group management problems are anticipated and alternative solutions proposed. In sum, facilitators should have the following five basic characteristics:

1. demonstrated experience and success in managing small groups
2. a clear understanding of group objectives
3. an unequivocal personal commitment to reaching those objectives
4. a sense of how to keep the group "moving down the road" toward group objectives without being authoritarian, and
5. a permissive, but persuasive, approach in encouraging group members to discuss group objectives and to adopt them as their own, although possibly in a modified form.

12. Provide opportunities for individuals to "sound off" and "ventilate" early and throughout the conference, so that they are not preoccupied with their own special interests and with awaiting an opportunity to be heard. Participants should be treated as the leaders that they are, rather than as school children who have homework and busywork to do. A plenary session summarizing the accomplishments and recommendations of work and special activity groups and encouraging further commitment from conference participants should be scheduled on the last of the meeting.

13. More careful attention must be paid to housekeeping details such as quality of food, adequacy of meeting rooms, and other basic factors which, if inadequate, may diminish conference success.

14. The schedule (or "parade," as one participant termed it) of conference speakers should be carefully planned to consider not only the topic for each talk, but other essentials such as the track record of the speaker, his personality and dynamism, his reputation and position, and his basic raison d' etre at the conference. A dynamic speaker (e.g. Reverend Jackson) should kick off the conference, followed by a high ranking official (e.g., Secretary Mathews) to provide legitimacy and commitment to the conference, followed by a prominent professional in the field (e.g., Dr. Roberta Siegel, an expert on childhood political socialization, or Dr. Howard Mehlinger). A properly planned conference considers all the principal variables which a given

personality can bring to his substantive remarks from the platform (race, personality, reputation, gender, status, etc.).
More than a logical/developmental/formal program with significant questions is needed to produce desired outcomes.

15. Questions of appropriate entertainment, religious influence, site, and accommodations for the conference (the second best hotel complex in Kansas City just will not do for a national conference when the rates are the same as the best), and other such logistical and co-curricular functions need to be worked out long in advance and seen not only from the perspective of the local host, but also from that of a visitor to the city.

16. Plans for a future national conference should also consider the following lessons from Kansas City: certain meals should be allowed away from the conference site; more local, state, or regional meetings should precede another national meeting; fewer banquet and formal speakers and more interactive work group sessions should be scheduled; improved pre-conference and in-session distribution of papers is needed; and participants' should be allowed to distribute their own papers (after all, even the editor of the resource book put his own piece on civics, however dated, into the conference record!).

17. As a whole, longer segments of time to discuss the formal presentations and special activities and to complete work group functions are necessary preconditions for future success of any such conference. However, this must be a self-imposed time restriction with a flexible schedule. Moreover, the rule should be

that only the most important temporal segments of the conference are predetermined, and the remainder are left for participants to decide according to their own judgement regarding the achievement of common objectives.

18. Conferences often have internal and unwanted divisiveness among different categories of the invitees because of pre-existent and external factors such as race, ethnicity, generic and socio-economic-status differences. However, when external rivalries betwen differing sponsoring groups for a conference reach the critical and public level, then the route to a conference disaster is predetermined. Consequently, any future conference planning must iron out major differences among principals as to goals, objectives, and expected outcomes. For this conference, all important differences should have been reconciled between the two USOE offices regarding use of the Delphi instrument, training of facilitators, speaking arrangements, conference evaluation procedures, and the like. Careful pre-conference planning must face and resolve this important source of potential conflict.

19. Any conference director has suspicions about whether or not participants at "his" conference really know what is best for them. At this conference the high quality of the conferees was such that they needed to be consulted before, during, and after the event. For example, the following is a typical example of a participant's summary view of basic effects and suggestions for improving this conference:

> "In my judgement, the meeting displayed these weaknesses: (1) lack of clearly stated objectives, (2) over organization (3) inappropriate use of the Delphi technique and (4) faulty recruitment techniques....People should understand why they're being asked to attend the meeting. The schedule should be flexible and allow sufficient time for informal interaction and discussion. An agenda focused around basic questions of concern to all participants should be substituted for the Delphi technique. Individuals who are actively involved in civic and community programs should be itentified and invited to participate."

One can ignore this kind of excellent feedback only at his peril, unless he is willing to repeat mistakes of the past.

VI. EVALUATION OF THE DELPHI PROCESS: A SPECIAL CASE STUDY

What Purposes Could the Delphi Have Served?

The great casualty of the Kansas City conference was the Delphi process. Before we dismiss it out of hand, however, we must ask ourselves: "Did the Delphi receive a fair trial?" It is the evaluators' assessment that it clearly did not. The Delphi process could have served the following invaluable purposes:

1. enabling participants to "buy into" the conference well in advance
2. encouraging them to give hard, serious thought to problems and issues of citizen education
3. getting them to organize and articulate their thoughts on paper, through identification and ranking of problems and issues as they saw them, and
4. strengthening their sense of identification with the conference, through the knowledge that their contributions would be used at the conference to further conference objectives.

What Actually Happened?

Why did the Delphi process not work out the way it was planned ? Why did it fall short of its potential? There are at least eight principal reasons, all of them instructive:

First, the Delphi instruments were mailed during the summer months-perhaps the worst possible time of year to get mail to recipients, to require hard thinking on difficult subjects, and to elicit a mail return. To prove the point, of about 1,000 instruments mailed to participants, 125 had been completed and returned by conference time, a very low response rate of 12.5%. In early September a different Delphi instrument, based on returns from the mailing to participants, was distributed to 250 experts in citizen education. The response to this mailing was somewhat better: 44 were returned for a response rate of 17.6%.

Second, no more than 1,000 participant instruments were circulated although about 2,000 persons were invited. Thus, at least half the invitees never saw the instrument. Somewhat more than half of the actual participants had apparently seen it; we have no count of the true number. We do know, however, that there were about 360 _active_ participants at the conference. If we assume that this number included all 125 who had returned their Delphi surveys, then it is evident that only one out of three of those actively participating had completed a form.

Third, this 50% ratio applied to work group facilitators and host recorders, as well. The training session for these key personnel on the Monday morning preceding the conference was proceeding superbly until someone asked, toward the end of the first hour and a half, "What's a Delphi?". With this question, the smooth flow of the meeting was essentially derailed, though only temporarily. The trainers responded as well as they possibly could have by:

a. explaining the nature, history, purpose, and process of the instrument

b. explaining what the Delphi was, what it was intended to do, and how it was being applied to serve the objectives of the conference.

c. reading the participant instrument in its entirety

d. sending a copy of the instrument for photo-reproduction. Unfortunately, the photocopies were not available until after lunch, about three hours later.

Fourth, the "game plan" for the six work group sessions was somewhat complex to cover in detail with the facilitators and host recorders in the time available; and the latter, in turn, were concerned about their ability to cover it adequately during the first work group session. Therefore, the decision was made to explain only that part of the plan pertaining to a given session. As a result of that decision, many of the work group participants never developed a full and clear picture of where they were heading and how they were going to get there.

Fifth, the trainers referred at least three times to the rigors of the conference schedules - rigors that were undeniable. Unfortunately, the extraordinary demands of the schedule combined with dubious commitment to the Delphi process to convince a few of the facilitators that their participation was just not worth the effort. Apparently, some of them discussed the combination with mounting annoyance during the lunch break, because they returned to the training session in a mutinous frame. Again, the trainers reacted appropriately: they defused the bomb with an offer to allow facilitators and recorders to withdraw then and there, without prejudice. One facilitator did eventually withdraw, although perhaps for different reasons.

Sixth, some of the facilitators were less than competent (as small group leaders) and under committed, (according to many observations recorded in participant evaluations). Others were quite effective and led their groups to the production of significant results.

Seventh, the presentation of Delphi results at the first work group sessions also generated unexpected reactions. It developed that some in each group had never seen the Delphi instrument, much less filled it out. A consensus set in, in some groups, that "these results are interesting, but they are not our results." The process was regarded by many as an imposition, not of their own making, acceptable only under protest. Some groups abandoned the process and went their own way. Some members of these groups later regretted their decision at the fifth and last work group session because they had "bought out of" the overall conference process.

Eighth, complaints were registered in the work groups and participant evaluations to the effect that the listings of global and domestic problems were too long, too confusing, and sometimes too interrelated to permit judicious ranking. Moreover, the method of ranking in order of importance from 15 to 1 created problems. Many participants in different work groups ranked them the first time from 1 to 15 - rather than in reverse order - even though the instructions were unequivocally clear - simply because that was their conception of the "natural order of things."

Then, having conscientiously made the rankings, members of some groups were upset to learn at the second session that the forms would not be used again; that is, they were not intended as a basis for ongoing work group action. Incredibly, a government official from the National Institute of Education in the group opined that the completed and consolidated rankings would be used for making policy and taking action by the bureaucracy in Washington. That set teeth on edge, because group members felt they had not had time to review and address the issues presented with sufficient thought and thoroughness.

How Could the Delphi Have Been Salvaged?

Under the circumstances, what could have been done at Kansas City to minimize the traumatic effects of the Delphi process? The conference coordinators did the best they could in the situation in which they found themselves. The only action that could have "saved" the morning training session for facilitators and recorders when the question arose, "What's a Delphi?", would have been the production of sufficient copies of the instrument to supply everyone, followed by thorough review of the instrument by those who had not seen it, discussion of the results of completed surveys, and a step-by-step discussion of the way in which the instrument was being used. Ideally, every person in the room would have voiced his understanding and acceptance (or rejection) before the discussion was concluded.

It is significant that the trainers were operating under time constraints not of their own making. They had requested at least a day and a half for the sessions and had been given about six hours.

Similarly, the objections raised at the first work group session should have been dealt with immediately at a plenary session, in the spirit of: "We've got a common problem here. This is what we were trying to do. These are some of the objections you raised. We see your point. Let's talk it out until we've agreed how we want to proceed from here." Such reaction was impossible, because of a schedule that was extraordinarily full, tightly scheduled, and inflexible.

Some Recommendations for Further Use of the Delphi

What, then, of the Delphi? It is probably worth another try, with different ground rules, and with a different name for this still unfamiliar process e.g., conference consensus/survey form. Here are several other suggestions:

1. Keep the consensus survey instrument short and simple, addressing only one or two key issues, so that it can be filled out adequately in perhaps twenty minutes, with an option for as much additional input as the respondent may care to contribute.
2. Explain in detail the objectives of the conference, and the specific way in which the survey returns will be used before and during the conference to advance conference objectives.
3. Be sure that every invitee receives the survey and returns it either completed or, optionally, reviewed but not completed, as part of "the price of admission."
4. Condense the responses on each question to no more than ten key concepts which can be readily comprehended. These

responses must become essential building blocks in the process of reaching conference objectives; and every participant must perceive that they are essential.

5. At the first conference plenary session, answer fully the question, "Why are we here?" Discuss the purpose of the conference, its objectives, the anticipated products, the longer-term benefits they can expect for themselves, their organizations, and their communities; and the process by which the planners propose to achieve the objectives and generate the intended product, to include the contribution to be made by the Delphi process.
6. Allow plenty of time for participant reaction - and pay attention to that reaction. If there is substantial dissent, modify the conference plan on the spot until consensus is achieved. A conference which has been designed to produce results will succeed only to the extent that participants are personally committed to objectives and outcomes.
7. Spend the first small-group session in such discussion of conference objectives and plans as group members find necessary; and act to dispel any dissatisfactions that spell trouble. Again, there is no point in proceeding until all group members are on board.
8. Spend the remaining time in the first session in self-introductions, with particular reference to how each group member sees himself as relating to the conference. Give him a chance to deliver

the "compulsory commercial" he brought to the conference. Otherwise, the time he chooses to deliver it may be confounding to all. Encourage fellow group members to ask questions. The goal is to let every group member "size up" or "get a feeling" for every other group member.

9. Introduce Delphi consensus survey results only as points of take-off. Let the group accept the list offered or come up with its own. Then let them refine the list as dictated by conference needs, through wide-open discussion until such consensus is reached.
10. See that each use of Delphi consensus results clearly ties into, and contributes to, the attainment of conference objectives.
11. Obviously, all the points made above should be incorporated into the training sessions for facilitators and recorders.

VII. FURTHER ANALYSIS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
(Phase II)

Phase II Analysis Proposed

Our proposal to the citizen education staff for this evaluation included a stage two plan for further analysis and follow up. In this activity we have proposed that the following tasks be undertaken:

1. complete our statistical analysis of the data obtained during stage one e.g., factor analysis of the teaching/learning environment scale and regression analysis of results.
2. complete our analysis of conference outputs such as the Delphi results and the work group reports in terms of basic conference objectives and external evaluation criteria.
3. Revise all conference evaluation forms for use in other USOE or privately sponsored conferences at the national, regional, state, or local levels.
4. most importantly, we believe that a follow-up evaluation of some 400 conference participants, leaders, and speakers is essential for the proper assessment of the outputs or effect of this conference. This would entail construction, distribution, and statistical/content analysis of all replies to a short (two page) questionnaire regarding a citizen education network and application of conference substance to one's own professional or work activity.

Other Follow Up Activities

In addition to these proposals, it is also suggested that the results of this conference evaluation be more broadly disseminated as a model to all participants as well as to conference leaders and participants in other citizen education conferences under USOE sponsorship. We would also propose that any future conferences should have an independent evaluation built in from the planning stages to obviate the difficulties encountered with this process at Kansas City. Such involvement would allow for clearer definition and statement of conference goals and processes from the start so that they could be more effectively achieved as well as evaluated. The independence of the evaluators must be maintained, however, so that an honest audit of the activity can be ensured and bias prevented. There is no use, however, in repeating mistakes of the past if we know how to avoid them from our experience.

APPENDIX I

Form #1

Part A

CONFEREE/PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF EDUCATION AND CITIZENSHIP CONFERENCES, SEMINARS, AND WORKSHOPS

Directions:

This questionnaire gives you the opportunity to express your views about this meeting and the way it was conducted. We want to know about your background, your opinion of the meeting site, facilities, and schedule, what you liked and disliked about the gathering, what you learned from this experience, and what you can do to improve the current status of citizenship education now and in the future.

This information will be used to improve the planning and administration of future citizen-education meetings sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education.

You are being supplied with four items: (1) A multiple-choice questionnaire, Form #1, Part A; (2) One IBM answer card; (3) one electrographic pencil; (4) An open-ended questionnaire, Form #1, Part B.
Questionnaire, Part A, with IBM answer card and electrographic pencil:

On the answer card, under NAME, please print the name of your organization or institution and your own last name.

Indicate the response (A to E) closest to your view by completely blackening both sides of the letter on the answer card for each question with the electrographic pencil. Should you wish to change a response to a question, simply erase completely your previous response and blacken the more appropriate space. Do not indicate more than one response to a question and do not use ink or ball point pen to record your answers on the answer card.

Begin your response by completing the background information requested on the answer card and Part B of Form #1, the open-ended questions. Please do not write on Part A of the questionnaire which will be used for future meetings.

Leave blank any question which you are unable to answer or which is not applicable to you.

Questionnaire, Part B, with pencil or (preferably) pen:

Please print or write legibly, in as much detail as you wish.

APPENDIX I

RESULTS (IN PERCENTAGES) OF PARTICIPANTS RESPONSES

Form #1
Part A

N = 182 RESPONSES OMITS > 10% ARE NOTED

Section 1: Participant's background, views on educational innovators and conference application procedures.

Omitted from analysis

1. Which term most accurately describes the overall type of meeting which you are attending?
1 A. Voluntary organization workshop 0 B. State seminar
3 C. Regional conference 1 D. Exemplary workshops
95 National conference

2. In which region of the country do you live?
25 A. Northeast 12 B. Southeast 48 C. Midwest
6 D. Northwest 10 E. Southwest

3. What is the approximate size and type of the area in which you work?
34 A. Large city between 50,000 and 250,000 22 B. Small city under 50,000 40 C. Metropolitan area over 250,000 4 D. Rural under 2,500 population 1

4. What is your sex? 35 A. Female 65 B. Male

5. What is your age?
7 A. 20-29 years 26 B. 30-39 years 35 C. 40-49 years
26 D. 50-59 years 7 E. Over 60 years

6. How would you primarily classify the organization in which you work? (Mark one answer either #6 or #7)
66 A. Educational 3 B. Religious 17 C. Governmental
7 D. Business and industrial 7 E. Voluntary community organization or foundation

Omitted from analysis

7. (Continuation of #6)
48 A. Home 16 B. Labor 4 C. Agricultural 28 D. Media OMIT N = 86%
4 E. Health

8. How large is the market or target population of consumers for which you supply your services?
10 A. Regional (several states) 5 B. International
23 C. Statewide 26 D. Nationwide 36 E. Local

9. For that part of your work which is educational in nature, what would you primarily classify yourself as doing?
53 A. Administration 21 B. Teaching 5 C. Research
20 D. Other

10. How many years have you been involved in education-related work?
9 A. Fewer than 5 years 17 B. 6 to 10 years 20 C. 11-15 years
12 D. 16-20 years 42 E. Over 20 years

11. How many people are directly responsible to you in work, i.e. work for you, have to answer to you, were hired by you, etc.
45 A. Fewer than 10 persons 23 B. Ten to 100 person
15 C. From 100 to 1,000 persons 3 D. More than 1,000 persons
13 E. None

12. Have you been primarily responsible in the past few years for initiating any new plans, programs, studies, etc. in citizen education?
69 A. Yes 30 B. No

13. Are you personally familiar with any new citizenship education programs, plans, studies etc. which are underway in the U. S. today?
70 A. Yes 29 B. No

14. Which of the following is most responsible for actual change or real innovation in citizen education in the U. S. today? OMIT N = 17%
18 A. Federal agencies such as USOE, NSF, etc.
8 B. Publishing firms 15 C. National professional organizations
47 D. Local educational authorities 13 E. State departments of education

15. Which of the following is most responsible for actual educational change or real innovation in citizen education at the local level?
14 A. School Superintendents 27 B. School principals and administrators 11 C. Department chairpersons and supervisors OMIT N = 12%
8 D. School boards 40 E. Teachers

16. Which of the following is most responsible for actual educational change or real innovation in citizen education at the college or university level?
10 A. National professional organizations 41 B. Professors and teachers 20 C. Individual departments and disciplines OMIT N = 19%
4 D. Administrators such as department head, deans, etc.
15 E. Instructional development/improvement offices

17. Which of the following is most responsible for actual educational change or real innovation for citizen education at the state level?
36 A. Chief state school officers or superintendents of of public instruction OMIT N = 23%
29 B. State supervisors of history, social studies, or citizen education 19 C. Influential colleges or universities in the state 13 D. State boards of education
4 E. State textbook selection committees

18. Which of the following types of organizations are most influential for effecting real educational change in the U. S. today? OMIT N = 11%
22 A. Private, non profit, or foundations 49 B. Educational
1 C. Regligious 6 D. Business, labor or agriculture
22 E. Governmental

19. Which of the following types of organizations is least influential for effecting real educational change or innovation in citizen education in the U. S. today?

12 A. Private, non-profit, or foundations 2 B. Educational
43 C. Religious 37 D. Business, labor or agriculture
7 E. Governmental

20. How significant would you say your role is as a key agent in citizen educational change at the local, state, or national level?
11 A. Cannot estimate their significance 8 B. Insignificant
26 C. Very significant 37 D. Moderately significant
18 E. Somewhat significant

21. How significant would you say most of the other participants (not staff, speakers, or leaders) are as key agents in citizen educational change at the local, state or national level?
31 A. Cannot estimate their significance 2 B. Insignificant
17 C. Very significant 37 D. Moderately significant
13 E. Somewhat significant

22. How much previous contact or involvement have you had with the citizen education field?
6 A. None 16 B. Very little 25 C. Some 30 D. Quite a bit
22 E. Very much

23. How much previous contact have you had with the sponsoring organization for this meeting?
23 A. None 23 B. Very little 31 C. Some 11 D. Quite a bit
12 E. Very much

24. Which of the following reasons best explains why you are attending this meeting?
19 A. It is part of my job 4 B. It is purely voluntary on my part 42 C. I am interested in citizen education
33 D. I was invited to attend 3 E. None of the above (please explain in open-ended comments for Part B of this questionnaire)

25. How did you hear about the conference?
55 A. Invitation for the sponsoring organization 15 B. Solicitation from another person or agency involved in the program 15 C. Referral of information from another person who was invited 15 D. By another method (please explain in open-ended comments for Part B of this questionnaire)

26. To what socio-economic class would you say you belong?
6 A. Upper 74 B. Upper Middle 18 C. Lower Middle 1 D. Lower

27. What is your religious affiliation?
59 A. Protestant 15 B. Catholic 10 C. Jewish 13 D. Other

28. What is your ethnic background?
7 A. Black/Negro 3 B. Hispanic 1 C. Asian/Pacific Islander
1 D. American Indian/Alaskan native 88 E. Caucasian/white

29. In terms of your overall political stance or attitudes, how would you classify yourself?
1 A. Extremely conservative 11 B. Conservative
48 C. Liberal 35 D. Middle of the road 6 E. Extremely liberal

30. In your opinion is a nationwide reform in citizen education necessary?
79 A. Yes 6 B. No 16 C. Do not know

31. Of the following, which study area do you believe is most crucial for the future success of citizen education in the U. S.
54 A. Political participation 17 B. Global perspective
9 C. Economics 15 D. Ethnic and multi-cultural
6 E. Business, labor, industry related

32. Of the following, which study area do you believe is most crucial for the future success of citizen education in the U. S.?
10 A. Historical (including U. S. Europe, and the world)
51 B. Political (includes civics, American government, problems of democracy, international relations)
29 C. Social Studies (includes interdisciplinary social science courses)
1 D. Geographical 9 E. Other (psychology, sociology, etc.)

33. Of the following, which study area do you believe is most crucial for the future success of citizen education in the U. S.?
15 A. Law-related/criminal justice 50 B. Valuative, ethical, and moral 16 C. Family-related 15 D.Social science/ behavioral studies 4 E. Other (please explain in Part B

34. Of the following, which is the most important reason why you are attending this meeting?
26 A. To meet and talk with others interested in citizen education
11 B. To obtain factual information about citizen education
12 C. To help with my professional growth
18 D. To learn about new approaches to teaching and learning in citizen education
34 E. To engage in give-and-take experiences with experts in citizen education

Section II: Participant's evaluation of meeting site, facilities, and general arrangements

NOTE: If you mark "No" or "Other" for any of questions 35-47, please explain in Part B.

35. Was the site for this meeting convenient for you?

90 A. Yes 9 B. No 1 C. Other

36. Were you satisfied with the facilites and/or accommodations for the meeting?

85 A. Yes 14 B. No 1 C. Other

37. Could the meeting site, facilities, or general arrangements have been significantly improved or continuing deficiencies (if any) corrected?

46 A. Yes 50 B. No 4 C. Other

38. Were the meal times and restaurant facilities in the area adequate?

85 A. Yes 7 B. No 8 C. Other

39. Were the dates of the meeting convenient?

91 A. Yes 9 B. No 0 C. Other

40. Were the coffee/coke/mealtime breaks adequate?

7 A. Too long 69 B. Adequate 22 C. Too short

2 D. Other

41. Was there sufficient time for you to establish informal contacts at this meeting?
33 A. Yes   65 B. No   2 C. Other

42. Was there sufficient time allowed for you to enjoy rest, reading, recreation and social occasions?
6 A. Yes   93 B. No   1 C. Other

43. Was the system for general communication at the meeting adequate?
66 A. Yes   32 B. No   3 C. Other

44. Were you satisfied with the general organization and scheduling of the meeting?
40 A. Yes   54 B. No   6 C. Other

45. Did you find this meeting as a whole to be of value to you?
85 A. Yes   6 B. No   8 C. Other

46. Approximately what percentage of the regular scheduled activities did you attend during this meeting?
3 A. Less than 25%   1 B. From 26% to 50%   8 C. From 51% to 75%
88 D. From 76% to 100%

47. Were the meeting rooms conducive to effective communication?
88 A. Yes   8 B. No   4 C. Other

Section III: Participant's Evaluation of the Program for this Meeting

48. During group-participation sessions you attended, about how often did you participate in the discussions?
2 A. Never   7 B. Seldom   70 C. About as much as most others
21 D. More frequently than most others

For questions 49-71, please rate the relevancy of each of the functions listed below according to the following key:
____A. Excellent   ____B. Above average   ____C. Average
____D. Below average   ____E. Poor

49. Registration arrangements
53 A.   23 B.   19 C.   1 D.   4 E.

50. No-host reception
32 A.   28 B.   35 C.   3 D.   2 E.

51. Presentation #1: Organization of the Conference
16 A.   36 B.   28 C.   8 D.   12 E.

52. Presentation #2: What are the Crucial Problems Facing American Citizens and our Society During the Next Quarter Century (1976-2001)?
20 A.   33 B.   29 C.   11 D.   8 E.

53. Presentation #3: An Historical Perspective of Citizen Education
41 A. 31 B. 23 C. 3 D. 2 E.

54. Presentation #4: Relationships Between the Crucial Problems and Various Sectors In American Society
16 A. 40 B. 29 C. 10 D. 5 E.

55. Presentation #5: What are the Current Problems and Deficiences of Citizen Education?
14 A. 27 B. 36 C. 17 D. 6 E.

QUESTIONS 56 - 62 Omitted from Analysis

56. Presentation #6: How can Citizen Education Help Resolve Crucial Problems?
25 A. 29 B. 37 C. 5 D. 5 E. OMIT N = 41%

57. Presentation #7: A New Citizen Education Program: Suggestions and Recommendations.
31 A. 38 B. 24 C. 3 D. 4 E. OMIT N = 44%

58. Presentation #8: A Personal Report of What Shaped Me as a Citizen
21 A. 27 B. 34 C. 4 D. 14 E. OMIT N = 69%

59. Presentation #9: Results of Delphi Survey
7 A. 9 B. 32 C. 14 D. 38 E. OMIT N = 62%

60. Presentation #10: What Should Be the Relationship of the Individual Citizen to the Larger Society?
25 A. 25 B. 39 C. 2 D. 9 E. OMIT N = 76%

61. Presentation #11: Work Group Reports
12 A. 22 B. 38 C. 14 D. 14 E. OMIT N = 62%

62. Presentation #12: Panel Discussions and Group Reactions
19 A. 34 B. 37 C. 4 D. 4 E. OMTI N = 63%

63. The thirteen presentations as a whole
8 A. 50 B. 34 C. 7 D. 2 E. OMIT N = 30%

64. The seven work group discussions as a whole
13 A. 35 B. 28 C. 16 D. 8 E. OMIT N = 23%

65. The four special activities as a whole
18 A. 39 B. 33 C. 9 D. 2 E. OMIT N = 23%

Section IV: Participant's Evaluation of Other "Inputs" for this Meeting

Using the same rating scale (____ A Excellent ____ B Above average ____ C Average ____ D Below average ____ E Poor), please rate the effectiveness of the following supplementary activities or "inputs" for this meeting.

66. The letter of invitation and related information about the meeting
18 A. 29 B. 27 C. 16 D. 11 E. OMIT N = 12%

67. Definition of purposes/objectives of the meeting
7 A. 20 B. 31 C. 22 D. 20 E.

68. Use of the Delphi survey instrument before the meeting
3 A. 15 B. 26 C. 20 D. 36 E. OMIT N = 15%

69. Use of the Delphi survey instrument during the meeting
3 A. 13 B. 17 C. 21 D. 47 E.

70. Consensus developed from the Delphi survey instrument by the end of the meeting
4 A. 14 B. 23 C. 20 D. 39 E. OMIT N = 23%

71. The displays of curriculum, teaching-learning, new social studies, and citizen education materials available at the meeting
12 A. 33 B. 43 C. 10 D. 2 E.

Section V: Participant's Evaluation of the Impact of This Meeting

Using the same rating scale (___A. Excellent ___B. Above average ___C. Average ___D. Below average ___E. Poor), please rate the effectiveness of the conference in addressing problems of citizen education in each of the categories listed below.

72. Home and community
7 A. 30 B. 35 C. 23 D. 5 E. OMIT N = 16%

73. School
18 A. 51 B. 23 C. 6 D. 2 E. OMIT N = 15%

74. Church
1 A. 11 B. 23 C. 40 D. 25 E. OMIT N = 23%

75. Business and industry
1 A. 10 B. 29 C. 31 D. 29 E. OMIT N = 21%

76. Labor
2 A. 5 B. 22 C. 39 D. 32 E. OMIT N = 22%

77. Agriculture
1 A. 4 B. 20 C. 32 D. 43 E. OMIT N = 25%

78. Local government
2 A. 16 B. 26 C. 35 D. 21 E. OMIT N = 23%

79. State government
2 A. 17 B. 31 C. 33 D. 18 E. OMIT N = 21%

80. Federal (national) government
9 A. 26 B. 32 C. 21 D. 12 E. OMIT N = 20%

81. Voluntary organizations
4 A. 13 B. 34 C. 31 D. 18 E. OMIT N = 22%

82. The mass media
5 A. 25 B. 34 C. 22 D. 13 E. OMIT N = 21%

83. The crucial problems of contemporary and future American society
10 A. 31 B. 33 C. 17 D. 9 E. OMIT N = 21%

84. Producing a necessary, practical, and desirable plan for the reformulation and regeneration of citizen education for the present and the future
3 A. 20 B. 31 C. 27 D. 20 E. OMIT N = 19%

Section VI: Participant's Evaluation of the Teaching-Learning Environment for This Meeting

In answering the questions below, use the following key: ___A (Highest rating) through ___E (Lowest rating)

85. To what extent did this meeting duplicate others which you have attended?
14 A. 21 B. 27 C. 16 D. 22 E. OMIT N = 13%

Omitted from Analysis

86. To what extent did you as a participant assume responsibility for making this meeting as productive as possible?
30 A. 47 B. 18 C. 5 D. 0 E.

87. To what extent did the conference leaders appear to know the subject matter of citizen education?
25 A. 37 B. 28 C. 6 D. 4 E.

88. To what extent did this meeting help to stimulate your interest in learning about citizen education?
28 A. 40 B. 23 C. 5 D. 4 E.

89. To what extent did this meeting provide an atmosphere which was conducive to learning about citizen education?
21 A. 40 B. 24 C. 12 D. 4 E.

90. How willing were the conference leaders to adjust the agenda of the meeting to adapt to participant-expressed interests and needs?
22 A. 27 B. 21 C. 20 D. 10 E.

91. How well did the meeting progress from a logical or meaningful beginning to a coherent conclusion?
5 A. 21 B. 29 C. 26 D. 18 E.

92. Did the conference leaders use pertinent examples to illustrate their points?
8 A. 37 B. 40 C. 9 D. 6 E.

93. Did the conference leaders talk or present material at a speed conducive to understanding?
22 A. 42 B. 27 C. 6 D. 3 E.

94. Were the presentations coherent and organized?
20 A. 43 B. 31 C. 4 D. 2 E.

95. How well did the conference leaders explain difficult ideas?
13 A. 39 B. 33 C. 10 D. 5 E.

96. How effectively did group discussions promote conference objectives?
11 A. 29 B. 33 C. 17 D. 10 E.

97. How much participant involvement was there in group discussions?
38 A. 38 B. 20 C. 4 D. 0 E.

98. How capably did the conference leaders direct group discussions?
23 A. 31 B. 27 C. 14 D. 5 E.

99. How well did the conference leaders answer questions from participants?
18 A. 35 B. 30 C. 12 D. 5 E.

100. How well did the host recorders summarize the contributions of individual group members?
26 A. 35 B. 21 C. 11 D. 7 E. OMIT N = 15%

101. How satisfactory was the balance between theory and application in this meeting?
5 A. 23 B. 40 C. 25 D. 6 E.

102. How well did the printed/duplicated material help to clarify the content objectives of the meeting?
7 A. 28 B. 32 C. 20 D. 12 E. OMIT N = 12%

103. How often did the staff and others talk with participants before and after formal sessions of the meeting?
14 A. 34 B. 33 C. 14 D. 5 E. OMIT N = 12%

104. How helpful were informal contacts with the conference leaders?
19 A. 29 B. 33 C. 12 D. 8 E.
OMIT N = 11%

105. To what extent were the conference leaders fair and impartial in dealing with participants?
41 A. 34 B. 19 C. 2 D. 3 E.

106. How would you rate the conference leaders' sense of humor?
33 A. 37 B. 21 C. 6 D. 3 E.

107. How sensitive were the conference leaders to the feelings of participants?
31 A. 37 B. 18 C. 8 D. 6 E.

108. How tolerant were the conference leaders to all points of view?
38 A. 31 B. 19 C. 6 D. 6 E.

APPENDIX II

FORM #1

Part B

CONFEREE/PARTICIPANT OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

(This form is optional but it will help to evaluate the Conference in depth. Please complete it if you have the time or send it with the attached envelope.)

Directions: This section of the questionnaire provides you with an opportunity to explain or qualify some of your choices in Part A as well as to express your general impressions of the conference. Please complete the following information before answering the questions below.

1b. About how many minutes did you spend in completing Part A of this questionnaire?______________________________minutes.

2b. PRINT NAME: (optional)______________________________________

3b. PRINT HOME MAILING ADDRESS:(optional)____________________Street

____________________________Town/City

____________________________State & Zip Code

____________________________Telephone Number & Area Code

4b. PRINT OFFICIAL POSITION AND MAILING ADDRESS:(optional)____________________________Position/Title

____________________________Firm/School/ Organization Name

____________________________Street

____________________________City/Town

____________________________State & Zip Code

____________________________Telephone Number & Area Code

5b. What is your function at the conference (Participant, Staff Member, Resource Person, Presenter, Reporter, Discussion/Work Group Leader, etc.)

____

-2-

6b. What sector do you represent? (Check one): Home_____; Education____ Religion_____; Business and industry_____; Labor_____; Government_____; Voluntary community organization _____; Media_____; Health_____; Agriculture_____; Foundation_____; Other_____(Please specify)__________

7b. If you have anything to add in the way of explanation or clarification for your response(s) in Part A, please do so here: (continue on reverse)

____

____

8b. What were the major objectives of this meeting as you perceived them?

____

____

____

____

9b. What were the strongest points of this meeting?______________________

____

____

____

____

10b. What were the weakest points of this meeting?______________________

____

____

____

____

11b. How could meetings such as this be improved in the future?____________

____

____

____

____

12b. What were the key questions you had in mind before you came to this meeting?

____

____

____

____

13b. What were the key questions you had in mind during this meeting?

____

____

____

____

14b. Which of these key questions were answered in whole or in part by the end of this meeting?______________________________

____

____

____

____

15b. Which of these key questions were not answered in whole or in part by the end of this meeting?____________________________

____

____

____

____

16b. Would you be willing to participate in an on-going effort in the near future for citizen education? _____Yes _____No

______Do Not Know (Explain):

____

____

____

17b. What techniques do you intend to use to inform others about the citizen education effort (e.g., program planning, media use, citizen organizations, textbook selection)?

____

____

____

____

18b. What is your personal conception of an ideal core curriculum for enhancing citizen education at the educational level with which you are most familiar?

____

____

____

____

In this portion of Part B, please detail any comments you wish to make about each of the following segments of this meeting:

19b. The twelve major conference themes identified in the principal presentations

____

____

____

20b. The appropriateness of the eight major social sectors (home, school, media, etc.) identified as impacting upon the crucial problem areas__________

____

____

____

21b. The twelve crucial problem areas of American society (energy, unemployment, environment, etc.) identified for special consideration at this meeting.____________________

22b. The four special activity groups____________________

23b. The seven work group presentations____________________

24b. The use of the Delphi instruments____________________

25b. Other summary comments____________________

26b. Approximately how many minutes has it taken you to complete Part B of this questionnaire?____________________minutes.

27b. Could this evaluation procedure be improved? (Please explain)

____

____

____

____

____

Thank you very much for your time, cooperation, and valuable assistance in making this and future conferences a worthwhile experience.

APPENDIX III

FORM #3

SPECIAL ACTIVITY LEADER'S/WORK GROUP FACILITATOR'S/HOST RECORDER'S

EVALUATION OF ASSIGNED ACTIVITY/EVENT

Which of the following sectors do you represent? Education ___
Religion ___ Business and industry ___ Labor ___ Government ___
Voluntary community organization ___ Media ___ Health ___
Agriculture ___ Foundation ___ Other: ______________________

To continue your response to any question, use the reverse side. Please enter the number of the question being continued.

1. Name (optional)____

2. Did you serve as a (choose one) Special Activity Coordinator_____,

   Work Group Leader________, Reporter__________________, or

   In another capacity (please specify):__________________________

3. What were the major objectives of the group(s) with which you worked in a leadership/reportorial capacity?

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

4. How did these objectives relate to the general objectives of the Conference?____

   ____

   ____

   ____

5. Which of these objectives were achieved? (Please cite any tangible evidences of achievement.)

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

FORM #3 (CONT.)

6. Which of these objectives were not achieved? What are your opinions as to why not?

____

____

____

____

7. How could this group activity be improved in the future?

____

____

____

____

NOTE: Please return this completed form to a Citizen Education staff member before the end of the meeting.

Thank you for your cooperation and contribution to Citizen Education.

RESOURCE PERSON'S/PRESENTER'S EVALUATION OF CITIZEN EDUCATION MEETING

Which of the following sectors do you represent? Education ___
Religion ___ Business and industry ___ Labor ___ Government ___
Voluntary community organization ___ Media ___ Health ___
Agriculture ___ Foundation ___ Other: ______________________

To continue your response to any question, use the reverse side.
Please enter the number of the question being continued.

1. Name (optional)____

2. Title/position/official capacity at this meeting(optional)

____

3. How long did you attend this meeting?____________________________

4. What were the major objectives of the meeting as you perceived them?

____

____

____

5. How did your professional effort relate to these objectives?

____

____

____

6. What activities/events did you observe or participate in while at this meeting?____

____

____

____

7. What are your general impressions about this meeting (site, staff, participants, program, resources, etc.)?__________________________

____

____

____

NOTE: Please return this completed form to a Citizen Education staff member before you leave the meeting site.

Thank you for your cooperation and contribution to Citizen Education.

APPENDIX V

FORM #2

PARTICIPANT OBSERVER'S EVALUATION OF CITIZEN EDUCATION MEETING

ACTIVITY/EVENT

Which of the following sectors do you represent? Education ___
Religion ___ Business and industry ___ Labor ___ Government ___
Voluntary community organization ___ Media ___ Health ___
Agriculture ___ Foundation ___ Other: ______________________

To continue your response to any question, use the reverse side.
Please note the number of the question being continued.

1. Date of observation: ______________________
2. Times of observation: From: ____________ To: ____________
3. Type of event/activity observed: ______________________
4. Name (optional): ______________________
5. Title/Position/Official Capacity (optional)______________________
6. What were the major objectives of the activity/event which you observed?

   ____

   ____

   ____

7. How did the activity/event contribute to, or coincide with, the general objectives for the meeting?

   ____

   ____

   ____

8. What were the strengths of the event/activity in terms of these objectives?

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

FORM #2 (CONT.)

9. What were the weaknesses of the event/activity in terms of these objectives?

____

____

____

____

10. To what extent did the leader/facilitator help the group to achieve its objectives?

____

____

____

____

11. How could the event/activity be improved in the future?

____

____

____

____

12. Other comments, personal observations.

____

____

____

____

____

NOTE: Please return this completed form to a Citizen Education staff member before the end of the meeting.

Thank you for your contribution to Citizen Education.

APPENDIX VI

PARTICIPANT RESPONSES - WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN FUTURE CITIZEN EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Question 16b. asked: "Would you be willing to participate in an on-going effort in the near future for citizen education?" Respondents entered explanatory comments covering the "Yes" category as well as "No" and "Do Not Know." All of these comments are recorded below.

The double-letter code in parentheses at the end of each comment identifies the questionnaire from which the comment is abstracted. All questionnaires are available for inspection in the office of the Citizen Education Staff, U.S. Office of Education.

Yes

It is a great topic. (AE)

Locally. (AG)

If time permits. (AP)

Would want to know better the goals of the effort. However, the area is vital. (AU)

Very interested. Good start. (AY)

Absolutely, and give it my all. (BO)

I have been working on it professionally for 15 years and will continue to do so in spite of meetings like this. (BP)

Definitely - YES. (BQ)

As time permits. (BR)

Decidedly! (CB)

There are will know viewpoint from parent. (CD)

I think that our institution would be anxious to participate in efforts to improve curriculum and to derive new concepts for application at the university level. (CF)

I am constantly working in Citizenship Ed. and have gained much from this conference and want very much to be involved in any on-going effort!!! (CK)

Because it is so important. (CL)

It is my hope that a higher priority can be placed on this area of education by all educational agencies and communities. I would like to be a part of the movement. (CM)

Delighted - this session has generated a deep interest in citizen education. Understanding the goal of the conference, seeing the beauty of diversified input. (CN)

It is a critical area of concern. (CO)

Enthusiastically! (CU)

Regional conference follow up in the states of Region III N.D. S.D. Utah Colo. Wyo. and Mont. (CZ)

If I clearly understand my function. (DA)

Has been one of my major professional concerns for years and see no need to change now. (DD)

The Citizenship Development Program at the Mershon Center would be willing to help in the design and execution of future conferences if that would seem useful. (DF)

The conference was discouraging but commitment runs deeper. (EG)

Question 16b. (continued)

No

Not if it purports to follow on from this conference. (BT)

Do Not Know

Much depends on the demand on my time. (AI)
I will have to have some time to reflect on the matter. (AL)
Time requirements vs. my available time. (AS)
. . . .My competence to speak in the public school setting since I come from non-public school setting. (BB)
It depends on the time and place. (BG)
Perhaps. Time could be a constraint. Having enough time to participate. (BH)
Willing yes - but only if I felt I could be of real service to the occasion as planned instead of being a pawn in a mammoth checkers game. (BM)
I felt that some grass roots organizing experience would be useful in developing further conferences. That could help sector participation, methods of getting to the central issue and getting it discussed, etc. (CI)
Limitations of time may be a strong factor. (CS)
Will be pleased to review each situation as it comes up. (CT)

APPENDIX VII

LISTING OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES - STRONGEST POINTS OF THE MEETING

9b. What were the strongest points of this meeting?

AA3	Dialogue with participants
AB3	Opportunity for discussions Outstanding speakers
AC5	Hearing what others were doing Special activities
AD5	Many viewpoints expressed
AE5	A good dialogue with large overview
AF5	Presentations by main speakers and activity session presenters
AG5	The sharing of ideas and activities already working toward the conference goal
AH5	The brainstorming discussions in the work sessions Dr. Coles address
AI10	The speakers at the general sessions were outstanding.
AJ10	People participating
AK10	The main speakers
AL12	The topics chosen The pre-meeting questionnaire
AM12	Good speakers Good organization
AN14	Some of the major speakers Some of the presenters at "Special Activities" The "mix" of people represented Availability of speeches
AO14	Work sessions, small groups Quality of presenters and participants
AP14	Good speakers Organized and well developed group discussions
AQ14	Complex area that needs to be worked on by all sectors of society
AR14	"Special Activity" presentations and discussions Contact with other educators and authors in this field
AS14	Variety and scope of expertise available
AT14	Special Activity Sessions Opportunity to meet others interested in this problem Obvious commitment of many to the major task
AU14	Highly planned attempt to get all participants to react on an equal basis
AV15	Discussion
AW15	Good speakers Good group leaders Lots of work in 3 1/2 days
AX16	General speakers - motivation and information Varied type of program throughout day
AY16	Breadth
AZ16	People I met Getting the "ball rolling"
BA16	Diverse groups Wide variety of opinions Corridor talk

9b.

BB17	Good input Good discussion Good activity groups Good "experts" available
BC17	Several of the speakers were outstanding. The sessions on ethics education were exceptional.
BD17	Challenging thoughts
BE17	The addresses The interaction with people across the country
BF17	The speakers The special activity (A)
BG17	Rap sessions Small group presentations Broad representation
BH17	Special Activities on Ethics
BI17	Meeting people active in my specific area of interest - law-related education
BJ17	Our group leaders ability to deal w/ a poorly planned and devised meeting
BK17	Group discussions Speeches
BL	The fact that the meeting was called Opportunity to meet with people with diverse viewpoints and experiences relating to citizenship education
BM	Jesse Jackson, Badi Foster, Rob't Coles, Freeman Butts (breakfast Tuesday morning)
BN	Participants
BO	Liked the selected attendance and how they got to business of conference Learned so much! Well programed
BP	Special activities
BQ	Topic - Citizenship Education
BR	General Session presentations Opportunities for exchange of ideas in the work sessions Special activity groups
BS	Potentially - the work groups A few speakers and presenters
BT	Certain presentations, eg, Butts

9b.

CA	The interaction of the various sectors of society was extremely important
CB	The speakers (except Abby and Buckley), particularly Secretary Mathews and Rev. Jesse Jackson
CC	The truly excellent speakers The exchange between the participants representing so broad a spectrum
CD	I don't have strong or weak points at this time, but there are some
CE	Participants
CF	Several lecturers--Coles, Jackson, Mehlinger Some very interesting and talented people that I met
CG	The education of our children Getting the community and parents involved
CH	The mix of people Some of the general session speakers Full scheduling of time
CI	The special groups were very informative, especially for one not in education Rev. Jesse Jackson
CJ	The work groups. We were able to relate our feelings, plus we had a good leader - George Lowe w/ the U.S. Office of Ed.
CK	Special Activity sessions "Some" of the speakers Interaction with others Renewed committment and inspiration The materials shared
CL	Meeting new people Sharing ideas
CM	Special interest meetings
CN	Input from diversified sectors Interaction within small group when people began to trust each other and really shared expertise
CO	Critical issue topic (Citizen Education) Special Speakers Discussions groups Interaction with others
CP	The spread of participants from around the nation The major speakers The small group organization, both special and work groups The tight schedule which forced people to stay with the task
CQ	Finding myself not alone in thinking citizenship is of a highest priority Sharing concerns and successes Some excellent speakers who really laid it on the line

9b.

CR	The various groups represented
CS	General Sessions - speeches Work Groups - discussions
CT	Talks
CU	Broad basis for participation outstanding approach at this point Sincere desire by HEW officials to study the problem and *listen* to suggestions from conference participants
CV	Participants!!! Their willingness and interest in working towards improved perceptions/attitudes about C.E. Special Activity Groups - well-prepared and presented Some speakers - Coles and Foster and Scriven
CW	Interactions with other participants Speakers Interest groups
CX	Concentrated attention (tight schedule) to a variety of approaches to citizen education, with some topflight addresses and good discussions
CY	Excellent speakers My workshop was very good - Facillitator excellent
CZ	Good coverage of the topic
DA	Many of the speakers at general sessions were fine Attention to presentations of specific programs in small groups; e.g. Fred Newmann's project Gillespie *et al* "Comparing Political Experiences"
DB	Main speakers Group discussions
DC	Excellent array of speakers Special interest group presentations
DD	Well organized presentation of the need for action Presentation and acceptance of diversity of opinion Emphasis and recognition that it is broader than school problem Dissemination of information on current programs
DE	Superficial identification of problems on citizen education Initial confrontation of problems by citizens Future publicity can realistically claim 14 hour work-days.
DF	The meeting brought together people from many sectors of society not just the universities and public schools. In addition, by the very fact of having taken place, the meeting called attention to the need to revitalize citizen education
DG	The main speakers Work group sessions

9b.

DH	Awareness developed between various sectors of society Brainstorming and exchange of ideas during work sessions (may not have been true in other work groups)
EA	Special activity groups - allowed most opportunity for interchange, presenters very competent
EB	((no entry))
EC	Interaction of participants
ED	General session speakers
EE	Major speakers
EF	Speakers: Butts, Jackson
EG	Some of the presentations in workshops

CATEGORIZATION OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES: STRONGEST POINTS OF THE MEETING

Question 9b. What were the strongest points of this meeting?

Each of the strengths is repeated below, together with all the comments that pertain to it, pro and con. Comments which incorporate more than one concept may appear under more than one category. The double-letter code which appears in parentheses at the end of each identifies the questionnaire from which the comment was abstracted. All questionnaires are available for inspection in the office of the Citizen Education Staff, U.S. Office of Education, or from the evaluators.

Quality of the Presenters

Outstanding speakers. (AB)
Presentations by main speakers and activity session presenters. (AF)
Dr. Coles address. (AH)
The speakers at the general sessions were outstanding. (AI)
The main speakers. (AK)
Good speakers. (AM)
Some of the major speakers. (AN)
Some of the presenters at "Special Activities." (AN)
Quality of presenters . . . . (AO)
Good speakers. (AP)
Good speakers. (AW)
General speakers - motivation and information. (AX)
Several of the speakers were outstanding. (BC)
The addresses. (BE)
The speakers. (BF)
Speeches. (BK)
Jesse Jackson, Badi Foster, Rob't Coles, Freeman Butts (breakfast Tuesday morning). BM
General Session presentations. (BR)
A few speakers and presenters. (BS)
Certain presentations, eg, Butts. (BT)
The speakers (except Abby and Buckley), particularly Secretary Mathews and Rev. Jesse Jackson. (CB)
The truly excellent speakers. (CC)
Several lecturers--Coles, Jackson, Mehlinger. (CF)
Some of the general session speakers. (CH)
Rev. Jesse Jackson. (CI)
"Some" of the speakers. (CK)
Special Speakers. (CO)
The major speakers. (CP)
Some excellent speakers who really laid it on the line. (CQ)
General Sessions - speeches. (CR)
Talks. (CT)
Some speakers - Coles and Foster and Scriven. (CV)

Question 9b.

Speakers. (CW)
Excellent speakers. (CY)
Many of the speakers at general sessions were fine. (DA)
Main speakers. (DB)
Excellent array of speakers. (DC)
The main speakers. (DG)
. . . presenters very competent. (EA)
General session speakers. (ED)
Major speakers. (EE)
Speakers: Butts, Jackson. (EF)

Interaction among Participants

Dialogue with participants. (AA)
Opportunity for discussions. (AB)
A good dialogue with large overview. (AE)
The sharing of ideas and activities *already working* toward the conference goal. (AG)
The brainstorming discussions in the work sessions. (AH)
Contact with other educators and authors in this field. (AR)
Opportunity to meet others interested in this problem. (AT)
Discussion. (AV)
Corridor talk. (BA)
Good discussion. (BB)
The interaction with people across the country. (BE)
Meeting people active in my specific area of interest - law-related education. (BI)
Group discussions. (BK)
Opportunity to meet with people with diverse viewpoints and experiences relating to citizenship education. (BL)
Opportunities for exchange of ideas in the work sessions. (BR)
The interaction of the various sectors of society was extremely important. (CA)
The exchange between the participants representing so broad a spectrum (CC)
Some very interesting and talented people that I met. (CF)
Interaction with others. (CK)
Meeting new people. (CL)
Sharing ideas. (CL)
Interaction within small group when people began to trust each other and really shared expertise. (CN)
Interaction with others. (CO)
Sharing concerns and successes. (CQ)

Question 9b.

Interactions with other participants. (CW)
Brainstorming and exchange of ideas during work sessions (may not have been true in other work groups). (DH)
Special activity groups - allowed most opportunity for interchange . . . . (EA)
Interaction of participants (EG)

Special Activities

Special activities (AC)
Some of the presenters at "Special Activities." (AN)
"Special Activity" presentations and discussions. (AR)
Special Activity Sessions. (AT)
Good activity groups. (BB)
The sessions on ethics education were exceptional.
The special activity (A). (BF)
Special Activities on Ethics. (BH)
Special activities. (BP)
Special activity groups. (BR)
The special groups were very informative, especially for one not in education. (CI)
Special Activity sessions. (CK)
Special interest meetings. (CM)
Special Activity Groups - well-prepared and presented. (CV)
Interest groups. (CW)
Attention to presentations of specific programs in small groups; e.g.
Fred Newmann's project, Gillespie et al "Comparing Political Experiences." (DA)
Special interest group presentations. (DC)
Special activity groups - allowed most opportunity for interchange, presenters very competent. (EA)

Diversity and Quality of Participants

People participating. (AJ)
The "mix" of people represented. (AN)
Quality of . . . participants. (AO)
Variety and scope of expertise available. (AS)
People I met. (AZ)
Diverse groups. (BA)
Wide variety of opinions. (BA)
Good "experts" available. (BB)
Broad representation. (BG)
Participants. (BN)

9b.

Liked the selected attendance and how they got to business of conference. (BO)
. . . participants representing so broad a spectrum. (CC)
Participants. (CE)
The mix of people. (CH)
Input from diversified sectors. (CN)
The spread of participants from around the nation. (CP)
The various groups represented. (CR)
Broad basis for participation outstanding approach at this time. (CU)
Participants!!! Their willingness and interest in working towards improved perceptions/attitudes about C.E. (CV)
The meeting brought together people from many sectors of society not just the universities and public schools. (DF)

Opportunities for Exchange of Information

Hearing what others were doing. (AC)
Many viewpoints expressed. (AD)
. . . large overview. (AE)
The sharing of ideas and activities already working toward the conference goal. (AG)
Availability of speeches. (AN)
Challenging thoughts. (BD)
Learned so much! (BO)
Opportunities for exchange of ideas in the work sessions. (BR)
The materials shared. (CK)
Sincere desire by HEW officials to study the problem and listen to suggestions from conference participants. (CU)
Good coverage of the topic. (CZ)
Presentation and acceptance of diversity of opinion. (DD)
Dissemination of information on current programs. (DD)
Awareness developed between various sectors of society. (DH)

Work Group Sessions

The brainstorming discussions in the work sessions. (AH)
Work sessions, small groups. (AO)
Organized and well developed group discussions. (AP)
Discussion. (AV)
Good group leaders. (AW)
Good discussion. (BB)
Rap sessions. (BG)
Our group leaders ability to deal w/ a poorly planned and devised meeting. (BJ)
Group discussions. (BK)

9b.

Potentially - the work groups. (BS)
The work groups. We were able to relate our feelings, plus we had a good leader - George Lowe w/ the U.S. Office of Ed. (CJ)
Interaction within small group when people began to trust each other and really shared expertise. (CN)
Discussion groups. (CO)
The small group organization, both special and work groups. (CP)
Work groups - discussions. (CS)
. . . good discussions. (CX)
My workshop was very good - Facillitator excellent. (CY)
Group discussions. (DB)
Initial confrontation of problems by citizens. (DE)
Work group sessions. (DG)
Brainstorming and exchange of ideas during work sessions (may not have been true in other work groups). (DH)
Some of the presentations in workshops. (EG)

Conference Organization

Good organization. (AM)
Highly planned attempt to get all participants to react on an equal basis. (AU)
Lots of work in 3 1/2 days. (AW)
Varied type of program throughout day. (AX)
Breadth. (AY)
Getting the "ball rolling." (AZ)
Well programed. (BO)
Getting the community and parents involved. (CG)
Full scheduling of time. (CH)
The tight schedule which forced people to stay with the task. (CP)
Concentrated attention (tight schedule)
to a variety of approaches to citizen education
with some topflight addresses. (CX)
Well organized presentation of the need for action. (DD)
Future publicity can realistically claim 14 hour work-days. (DE)

Subject Matter

The topics chosen. (AL)
Complex area that needs to be worked on by all sectors of society. (AQ)
Topic - Citizenship Education. (BQ)
Critical issue topic (Citizen Education). (CO)
The education of our children. (CG)

9b.

Finding myself not alone in thinking citizenship is of a highest priority. (CQ)
Superficial identification of problems on citizen education. (DE)

Other Strengths (not categorized)

The pre-meeting questionnaire. (AL)
Obvious commitment of many to the major task. (AT)
Good input. (BB)
The fact that the meeting was called. (BL)
I don't have strong or weak points at this time, but there are some. (CD)
Renewed committment and inspiration. (CK)
Emphasis and recognition that it is broader than school problem. (DD)
In addition, by the very fact of having taken place, the meeting called attention to the need to revitalize citizen education. (DF)